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Monday, 17 September 2001

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. Margaret Reid) took the chair at 2.00 p.m., and read prayers.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: TERRORIST ATTACKS

Senator HILL (South Australia—Leader of the Government in the Senate) (2.00 p.m.)—by leave—I move:

That the Senate:

(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.

(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.

As the Senate meets to debate this motion, on the other side of the world in the middle of the night a small army of courageous rescuers, many of them volunteers, continue their efforts to find life within the ruins of what once were the twin towers of the World Trade Centre. Almost a week has passed since we watched with horror as the unprovoked and cowardly attacks on Washington, New York and Pennsylvania unfolded. It is still impossible to comprehend the depths of evil and cruelty which could have motivated such a senseless and vicious attack. We are still unsure of the extent of the human tragedy caused by these barbaric attacks: around 5,000 lives senselessly wasted; thousands of families both in the United States and around the world left to grieve their loved ones and to try to make some sense of why this has happened to them.

As a parent who knows what it is like to have children living or working overseas for extended periods of time, I deeply sympathise with those Australian families who have had their worst fears confirmed. I also feel for those families who wait in hope to hear news of their loved ones still missing in the wake of these attacks. It is important for these families to know that they are not alone in their time of grief. The Australian people share their anger, their outrage and their sorrow. With them, we continue to hope against hope that some good news will emerge.

That sympathy is also extended to the family of New South Wales woman Amanda Rigg, who was killed in another senseless act of terrorism in Istanbul last week. The attacks in the United States might stand out in their enormity, but the death of this young woman again underlines the growing threat that terrorism poses around the globe if we allow it to go unchecked.

At this time of global uncertainty, it is also vitally important for the people of the United States to know that our nation stands with them in condemning those responsible for these attacks. The Prime Minister has already conveyed to President Bush Australia’s very deep sense of condolence, our empathy and our compassion for the American people. He has assured him of Australia’s resolute solidarity with the American people—we will stand by them, we will help them and we will support actions they take properly to respond. Today’s motion gives the Senate the opportunity to endorse and reinforce that message.

I also take the opportunity in a formal sense to inform the Senate that the Prime Minister has announced that the government has decided, in consultation with the United States, that articles IV and V of the ANZUS
Treaty apply to the terrorist attacks on the United States. This action has been taken to underline the gravity of the situation and to demonstrate our steadfast commitment to work with the United States in combating and defeating international terrorism. Let us make no mistake: this was not just an attack on the United States but also a direct attack on the institutions of freedom, democracy and the rule of law that we in Australia, and so many people around the world, hold dear.

If we truly value our own freedom, we must be ready to defend the freedom of others from the barbaric acts of terrorism we have witnessed in the United States. Those responsible must be found and punished. The democratic world must no longer be held hostage to such horrendous behaviour. We must also redouble our efforts to address injustice, intolerance and poverty wherever they occur.

But also we must not lash out blindly in anger. This message is as relevant domestically as it is internationally. Attacks on individuals or groups on the basis of their ethnic background or religious or cultural beliefs simply undermine the values we seek to uphold. To simply lash out vengefully is incompatible with the values of a peace loving, democratic nation.

Out of the sorrow and the suffering of the past week have also come inspirational stories of great personal sacrifice and strength. I have already made mention of the firefighters, paramedics and other volunteers risking their lives at both disaster sites, many of whom lost close colleagues who had been performing similarly heroic deeds when the twin towers collapsed. The sense of unity that has swept across the United States has revealed the true strength and grit of that nation’s people. That this sense of unity has been shared by all freedom loving people in the democratic world gives me great confidence that as a united force we can stare down the threats of those who would have us cower in the face of terrorism. I close with the words of the famous American aviationist Amelia Earhart:

Courage is the price that Life exacts for granting peace.
I commend the motion to the Senate.

Senator FAULKNER (New South Wales— Leader of the Opposition in the Senate) (2.07 p.m.)— The opposition supports the motion moved by the Leader of the Government in the Senate. A new chapter is being written in American history, one of tragedy and terror but also of strength and courage 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 the United States of America such a great and resilient nation. We saw it in the selflessness of the rescuers, those firemen and police who charged up the stairs of burning buildings and were never seen again. We saw it in the courage of those who helped others to safety and in the courage of those still waiting to hear the fate of their friends and family members, and we saw it in the courage of the people on the aircraft who sacrificed themselves in order to stop a greater tragedy.

We will never forget the horror of this attack. However many times we bring it to mind, I do not think we will ever get used to it. 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 did not know quite how or why. Today we think of the American victims—hundreds of them—and their families, and we also think of the 70 or more Australians missing, many believed dead in this terrible tragedy. We 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. But we must show our support for the United States in this fight because the fight against international terrorism is our fight. That is not only because of those Australians missing, believed killed, but also because of our belief in freedom, a belief that we hold in common with the United States.

It was a shocking thing to think of the vulnerability of the Australians accompanying the Prime Minister in Washington at the
time of the attack so very close to the White House, which we now believe only escaped harm through the self-sacrifice of the passengers on the flight that went into the ground near Pittsburgh. Nevertheless, we are glad that the Prime Minister was there in the United States and was able to go to the Congress and add our support in person at a time when it must have meant a lot to our allies to have him there. His presence there certainly brought the events closer, as did the knowledge that so many Australians have been lost. And our hearts go out to their families as they await news.

The scale of this unspeakable act of terrorism is so great we sometimes lose sight of the loss of up to 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. 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 our condolences to his family, friends and political colleagues as they await news of Andrew. Andrew Knox was a member of the South Australian branch of the Labor Party and a member of our campaign team at the last election in Makin, the area in which he grew up 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. Our deepest condolences go to Tom and Marion, Andrew’s parents, and Stuart, 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. Our thoughts and prayers are with their families. Let us not forget either the many other nations that are mourning lost sons and daughters today. The size of the calamity is truly international. Among the missing are 100 Britons, several hundred Germans, at least 50 Bangladeshis, 70 Italians, and many Pakistanis and Malaysians. It seems that nearly 40 nations have lost citizens in this shocking attack.

We have heard that there have been some who have blamed all Muslims for this tragedy, and 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 has stressed that all New Yorkers—Muslims, Jews, Christians, Hindus, Buddhists and others—are appalled. He has called on his fellow New Yorkers not to let the terrorists win by losing their humanity at this time. If a man who has had to deal with the full horror of this in his own city can keep his community together, surely we can keep our community together. We 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 very 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 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 United States government’s rational, deliberative and calibrated approach in response to this tragedy. America’s quiet, unyielding anger is not doubted, and it is shared by its friends. Lincoln said 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 try to avoid creating any more martyrs—anything that would feed the terrorists’ cause. The great challenge before the US government is to show its people that it means to stop this sort of terrorism, but not at the expense of people’s basic freedoms,
freedoms on which the United States of America was founded.

This sort of behaviour is not new. In every generation and in many countries, people have sacrificed themselves and others to draw attention to their causes. The difference now is technology—the sheer scale of the terror that they wreak. Difficult though it is to believe, the scale of this atrocity could have been and could one day be even greater. Nuclear or chemical or biological weapons could have been involved. 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 terrorist cause that creates new martyrs. It takes commonsense and coolness, and the United States of America has shown that in recent days.

We must heed the call for help from our ally. We in Australia remember our darkest hour in World War II when our wartime Prime Minister, John Curtin, called on the Americans for help and they did not let us down. In the Battle of the Coral Sea and the Battle of Midway, they were there for us and fought valiantly, with many lives lost, to halt the progress of the enemy. We will be with them again, as we have been in every major conflict over the last 100 years. We must do our utmost to assist in fighting this most difficult enemy, one that lives in the shadows, one without a face. We do have to beat it, because it has struck right at the heart of what we believe in, at our freedom and at our safety. The attacks on New York City 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 coalition to fight terrorism wherever it threatens democratic and peaceful nations, as suggested by Secretary Colin Powell. This will mean integrating our intelligence and police agencies more closely with their international counterparts. It will also mean providing appropriate military and police support to international counter-terrorism operations. A long-term counter-terrorism strategy and resource commitment is now required. The role of the SAS and Commonwealth law enforcement and intelligence agencies will be critical, and they must have the tools to do their job in the modern terrorist environment. We in the Labor Party have already put forward some ideas to combat terrorism here in Australia. This is a time for bipartisanship, for working together, and we look forward to joining the government to talk further on this.

We have seen an extraordinary outpouring of emotion in Australia over this tragedy. We have seen flowers placed outside consulates and people flocking to places of worship yesterday to add their prayers and thoughts to those of Americans for all those killed and, of course, those who have lost their friends and family. It is at times like this that you come back to what is truly important in all our lives: family, friends, community, security. It is those that have been attacked, and those are what we must defend.

Senator STOTT DESPOJA (South Australia—Leader of the Australian Democrats) (2.21 p.m.)—The tragic terrorist attacks in America affect Australians and Australia, first and foremost of course those who have lost loved ones. There are 69 Australians still unaccounted for and three confirmed dead among the 5,000 estimated fatalities. It is a time of great sorrow. As Senator Faulkner mentioned, one of those Australians missing is Andrew Knox, who was working in the World Trade Centre on the 103rd floor. I apologise for being late to the chamber as I was speaking with Stuart, Andrew Knox’s brother. Andrew is a dear friend of mine, and I join with Senator Faulkner in sending our best wishes to his family at this time and our condolences. The pain being felt by Andrew’s family and his friends—many of
whom are in this building—as they wait for news is repeated a hundred times across Australia today.

This is actually one of the biggest single losses of Australian civilians in our history. The difference between civilians and service personnel is one that civilised nations hold dear and it is one that we must maintain in the times ahead. Everyone, not just those with a personal connection to this tragedy, will remember where they were when they heard or when they saw these events unfold. We need to acknowledge that the feelings of sorrow, fear and, in some cases, anger extend to many Australians. The immediacy of the images makes it feel so close. Courage, compassion and respect for the rule of law must guide us. We cannot turn our backs and we cannot strike out blindly. International cooperation and the role of the United Nations will be the key. There is no quick salve and justice may be slow.

The difficulty of bringing those responsible to justice is frustrating, but I believe that the guilty will be punished and that justice will be done. It is important that grief does not ruin reason. There will be no appeasement, but the military response to this terrorist attack must be proportional. America and its allies have enormous firepower but not an accurate target. Random attacks would be tantamount to terrorism itself. Leaders must keep cool heads and pain must be tempered by patience. There are both legal and moral issues of international violence: foremost is the difference between innocence and guilt. Rash and random military retaliation would not only be morally wrong but would be counterproductive. As the Canberra Times editorial said:

Americans are justifiably angry, but their wrath must reflect the civilisation under attack, not the barbarity which would bring it down.

Our aim is to reduce risks rather than to inflame tensions. The Democrats believe that the ultimate aim must be peace, not World War III. We need to respect the rule of law and particularly the rules of war: that civilians are not legitimate targets of war and that the ultimate aim is peace. We must strengthen international ties; more than ever the world needs cooperation. A war against terrorism can be fought only through international cooperation, particularly through the United Nations.

Australia feels the emotional and the political fallout of terrorism in America; other fallout as well, militarily and economically. There are strong and enduring factors that sustain the US-Australian relationship. Our two countries have similar cultural and ideological heritages and there are strong technological and economic links. In fact, an attack of this kind only highlights how small the world has become. We are closer to other people on the other side of the world than ever before, and not just Americans, because our grief today is spread across the world. The enemy in this instance can be identified not by a religion or a race but by their actions. This is not about where people are from or what they wear or the God they worship. If we inflame racial and religious based hatred and intolerance, the terrorists will have struck another blow. I commend the addition of point No. 8 to the motion. We should be clear that the United States has declared a war against terrorism, not a war against Muslims.

The Democrats stand by our record on foreign affairs and defence policy, and specifically our stand on ANZUS and the proposed US national missile defence system. In the war against terrorism, the strategy of mutually assured destruction, weapons of deterrence and weapons of mass destruction are of little use: clearly certain death is not a deterrent to this enemy. Australia must continue to support international multilateral frameworks and treaties, such as the anti-landmines Ottawa treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Australia must examine our readiness to face this kind of attack. The focus of the defence white paper was traditional threats. The Democrats continue to believe in the importance of an Australian Defence Force with independent capability, as well as well-resourced reserve forces and, of course, emergency services.

There have been calls to ratify the two outstanding United Nations conventions on terrorism. Defence minister Peter Reith’s response yesterday on the Meet the Press
program is that we do not need to sign onto these treaties because they are already covered under domestic laws. I would think that would indicate that we agree with the treaties' intent, that we should sign and that we should encourage other nations to do so. The best support Australia can give in the fight against terrorism is intelligence, rather than just military. The response must be information-led—we need to know the enemy. The war on terrorism may entail further restrictions on privacy but it must be balanced, of course, with a respect for freedom. If we create a police state, then terrorism has won. Terrorism is a threat that Australia has rarely been touched by to date. In light of recent events, the Australian Democrats would support more resources being allocated to Australia's intelligence services.

The motion before us today, by and large, is an expression of horror at the events that have taken place. It is also an expression of sympathy and condolence, not only to the people of the United States but to those Australians affected. I endorse Senator Faulkner's point that we must not lose sight of this fact. It is not entirely appropriate that the government has included at the end of this motion of condolence two points that are somewhat ambiguous. I will take the opportunity to clarify the Australian Democrats' position and our understanding of their intent and scope. Point (6) refers to the ANZUS Treaty. We should be clear about what article IV, to which the government refers in the motion, says. It says, in total:

Each Party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific Area on any of the Parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

In other words, it has always been the intent of the ANZUS Treaty that the United Nations would have a central role.

The seventh point of this motion does not give parliament approval to an open-ended commitment of Australian troops outside a United Nations mandated action. We would certainly hope that is not the intent behind the point of that motion. This could not possibly be the intention of the motion. We are sure on a matter as serious as this that the government would act honourably and that the parliament would have the opportunity to examine any commitment of Australian troops. This is too serious a matter to be slipped onto the end of a condolence motion. In fact, it would be highly inappropriate.

Of course Australia should do everything possible to help find and take action against those responsible for these horrible attacks, and there are many ways that Australia could conceivably assist with intelligence, medical and logistics support, ships and possible special forces troops. But this parliament should not and it cannot, and I hope it would not, make an open-ended commitment of Australian troops under United States command at this time. So at this stage we give the government the benefit of the doubt on point (7), although I think it would be more appropriate that that section of the motion should be removed from a condolence motion before us.

Senator Vanstone—Don't you know the difference between a condolence motion and a debate?

The PRESIDENT—Order! Senator Stott Despoja has the call.

Senator STOTT DESPOJA—Madam President, the majority and the spirit of this motion is respected by the Australian Democrats, and the condolences are felt wholeheartedly.

Senator BOSWELL (Queensland)—Leader of the National Party of Australia in the Senate and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Transport and Regional Services) (2.31 p.m.)—On behalf of the National Party of Australia, I fully support the condolence motion moved by the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Less than two years ago, we celebrated the birth of a new millennium. Only a year ago, we were cheering at the Olympics. Just a couple of weeks ago, we had the Goodwill Games. And then, only a few days ago, America was
We left behind a century bitten by bloody conflict and massive loss of life by man’s own hand. We welcomed new hope and a new beginning. Our champions ran and swam faster than ever before. We basked in sporting glory and 100 years of democratic nationhood. Now we know that we left nothing behind after all. Human barbarism followed us into this new millennium, it stalked our celebrations and it shadowed our ceremonies until it caught up with us on 11 September, when it targeted our freedom. Just eight days before, our symbol of freedom, the Australian flag, was 100 years old. Then we knew who we were and where we were going. Today, we do not know where that flag will take us tomorrow.

In this year of our Centenary of Federation, I have often spoken about the need to cherish and value our democracy and political institutions. I have met the overly cynical attacks on politicians with disquiet. In uncertain times; we must be united in our beliefs of what is important, we must be united to be strong. When American sovereignty is attacked, Australian sovereignty is attacked also. When Americans die, Australians die. The victims of the attacks in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania are universal martyrs of democracy, of a way of life that cherishes freedom, democracy and equality. That is the thing about democracy: you do not need to be a soldier to be a hero; your freedom defines you, not your uniform. Only the older generations of Australians have known this kind of terror. It has not been visited upon our younger generations until now. How innocent their days have been, how light their worries, how bright their hopes, until 11 September sullied an acknowledged innocence. Young children have been exposed to trauma that not even their parents have witnessed.

We meet here today to express our deep condolences to the victims and to consider what responsibilities we must take on to overcome such monstrous, cowardly and savage brutality. As law-makers and leaders, we must deliberate wisely and act with measured courage. Our country has risen to the occasion many times in the past, and it will do so this time also. Our relationship with America changed last week, because Australians were victims in the planes and in the buildings. We are soldered in the same grief. Because our Prime Minister was in Washington, the Australian people are indelibly written into the events that unfolded. We were there with them at this terrible hour. We were on hand to offer our support. When the Speaker of the United States Congress acknowledged our Prime Minister and the grief-stricken Congress rose as one in a standing ovation, we were there.

The American people will rally in their grief and in their anguish. They will draw deeply from their reservoir of faith and confidence in what they believe. They will be formidable in their defence of freedom. They are fortunate to have had such a rich history of outstanding leaders over the centuries to guide them. There was Gettysburg in 1863, where 51,000 Americans were slain or wounded. Almost without exception, the fallen were soldiers. Today, almost without exception, they are civilians. Abraham Lincoln finished his famous Gettysburg dedication with words that ring more loudly now than for many years:

... we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

In 1917, President Woodrow Wilson stated that ‘the world must be made safe for democracy’. Democracy is again unsafe today. These attacks on it are not made by declarations of war by foreign governments, they are not made by anyone who has been freely and democratically elected to do so and they are not voted on or supported by large communities of people. They are made by autocratic, self-styled leaders of shadowy groups who so debase the value of life and liberty that they send their deluded, indoctrinated, fanatical followers to violent deaths alongside their innocent civilian victims. It is an evil mind that can do that which violates the fundamental tenets of the three great religions—Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

When President Kennedy made his famous speech about the Berlin Wall in 1963 he said, ‘Freedom is indivisible, and when
one man is enslaved, all are not free.’ Today we face a new wall: the yellow wall of terrorism. In his Inaugural Address, President Kennedy issued a call to the nations of the world that echoes powerfully today. He said:

My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man ... ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you.

On 11 September, America paid a terrible sacrifice. All democracies must now ask the question for a new century: what can we do together for the freedom of man? Indeed, what is there that together we cannot do? Today our sovereignty is breached and violated. When we were in Melbourne in June, recalling the legacy of leaders who served us so bravely during past threats to our sovereignty, who would have thought that our role would change so swiftly from celebration to confrontation, with war’s infamous cousin, terrorism? God grant us the ability to emulate the legacy of earlier generations of Australians— their courage, their wisdom, their strength and their unity.

Senator COOK (Western Australia—Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Senate) (2.39 p.m.)—I support the motion.

On 4 July 1776 the then 13 United States of America declared their independence with these words:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

These words remain today as the finest expression of human aspiration ever given official form. They form an ideal for all of us as individuals, they form an ideal that society at large strives for and they form an ideal which we in this parliament, as representatives of the Australian people, in our wisdom struggle to encode into wise laws. That they are not Australian words or that they came from another era does not matter; they do have an international resonance. For the thousands who died last week in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania these words now cease to have a meaning—their lives are gone, their liberty abruptly curtailed and the happiness in their lives brutally extinguished for all time.

The 21st century has dawned ignominiously. Whatever innocence there was left over from the last 100 years has now vanished. The new reality is that hatred and its offspring, terrorism, now threaten all of us wherever we are, no matter how innocent we are. This century, sadly, has dawned with a new high-tech terrorism. Those who work in buildings of iconic architecture, in offices of government administration, in the airline systems of the world and almost anywhere where there are any other nationally important activities are the frontline.

Fear of flying, for those among us reluctant to board an aircraft, has given way to a wider fear about who might be flying with us—what is their purpose and what hidden dangers are there in the cargo bay? There is no greater symbol of this new and dangerous era than the photograph that last week appeared on the front page of the Herald Sun. It was of a Boeing 737 in the shadows of the World Trade Centre moments before impact. This fearful image had the simple and accurate headline ‘Pure evil’.

Our thoughts today are with those who have died, with their families and with their loved ones. Our thoughts are with the myriad rescue workers who, even now, are toiling to free up the site, to recover the bodies, to provide decent and respectful funerals and to repair the damage. Some of the most poignant images of this disaster are of the heroism of these workers, of the people who on the hijacked planes rang home and of those in the buildings facing death transmitting their last expressions of love before vanishing forever.

For Australia, there is the particular grief of the 69 missing Australians and their families and friends. This motion before the Senate means that the Senate gives its condolences to all of those who are suffering, all of those who have been hurt and all of those who have died. Like all expressions of grief, it always seems insufficient in the circumstances. Our expressions of grief, though, are nationally symbolic, are heartfelt and are extended not just to the Americans and the Australians involved but to the citizens of the
other estimated 38 countries which have lost their own fellow countrypersons as well.

Today US Ambassador J. Thomas Schieffer made an impressive and memorable speech to the memorial service in the Great Hall at Parliament House. He made in his remarks a vital point, and I wish to quote it. He said:

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 great faiths, is that love must conquer hate, good must defeat evil.

These are sentiments that I am sure all of us in the chamber join with. The justice that now must be delivered to the perpetrators is a justice that Australia must play its part in delivering. We are committed to this end. The Australian Labor Party has set out a list of national and international actions that can be taken. As has been said, we stand ready to join a bipartisan approach to ensure the most comprehensive and unifying national action.

It is important that the right people are dealt with. This is a sentiment given ample voice in the Senate chamber today. It reminds me of what Tom Friedman said in the New York Times last Friday:

Because these Muslim terrorists did not just want to kill Americans. That is not the totality of their mission. These people think strategically. They also want to trigger the sort of massive U.S. retaliation that makes no distinction between them and other Muslims. That would be their ultimate victory—because they do see the world as a clash of civilisations, and they want every Muslim to see it that way as well and to join their jihad.

That development must be resisted. We must deal with the perpetrators because any other course will play into their hands and ignite a possible conflagration that will end the lives of many other innocent people. Our strength is that we stand for the innocent and for civilisation and that we stand against terrorism.

But there is time to do the right thing.

Today we should show our resolve and today we should express our sympathy to the victims and our horror at the acts of terrorism that have occurred. Today is an occasion to praise the rescue workers, to back the ANZUS declaration and to support the United States. At the end of the day, it does come down to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—to deliver these basic aspirations to all people. It is as human as that, and that is our task.

Senator BROWN (Tasmania) (2.46 p.m.)—On behalf of the Greens, I join all senators and my fellow 19 million Australians in extending the deepest sympathy and a strong comforting arm to everybody affected by the appalling carnage in America. The terror of last Tuesday turned four civilian aircraft loaded with passengers into firebombs which have left thousands dead or maimed in Lower Manhattan, Washington and that field in Pennsylvania. I grieve for the tens of thousands who have lost loved ones—family members, friends and colleagues. My heart aches for the more than 70 Australians and the many other citizens around the world who died in these cowardly attacks.

This criminal tragedy has made the world reflect on the hazards, as well as on the promise, of globalisation—indeed, on the future of all human community on the earth. If the exquisite, once-only experience on earth of human life is not to come to nothing, we at the dawn of this century must find a way to a more enduring peace and security. Even after the wars of the 20th century, Tuesday’s unintelligent, unloving and spiteful sabotage of our innocent fellow human beings’ lives—the lives of thousands of warm-hearted people—shows that we have achieved neither enduring peace nor security in the world community. The path to achieving those ideals is away from that of grinding poverty being permitted side by side with prodigious wealth. Security cannot coexist with the global arms trade. Peace will not be found beneath a trillion-dollar shield or above missile silos. True happiness cannot come without true security and peace being shared by and available to everyone.

As a Green, I accept that the reality of our existence will always depend upon policing against evil—that the price of peace is indeed eternal vigilance. But we must work for a world in which that vigilance is against true evil, not against the hungry seeking food, the powerless seeking power or the
despised seeking acceptance. The true goal of globalisation in terms of power must be one person, one vote, one value. In terms of possession, it must be assured food, assured shelter, assured education and assured opportunity for every citizen on the globe. In terms of purpose, it must be access to love, to community, to creativity and to having a personal part in the building of the future for everyone.

These things do not now exist for millions of people around world, but we must work to ensure that they do. We cannot survive with the power of modern technology unless together, as one world, we ensure that power is used in the service of all and is itself made subservient to achieving a safer world in the interests of all life on this earth into the future. The way ahead is via global welfare and democracy. We will not survive a world of inequality, for inequality breeds enmity and enmity breeds hate.

Like all the world at this moment, I do not know who decreed Tuesday’s terrorism. Whoever planned it and for whatever reason, it is utterly unforgivable. If it does involve Osama bin Laden, all the more so, for his wealth speaks for itself. His use of the power flowing from that wealth is unforgivably and utterly corrupt. His invocation of God or Allah is the sign not of madness but of an arrogant and misplaced effort to blame the mystical for his own egoistic disdain for the innocents his targeting has killed. The deities have no place in politics. In politics we are utterly responsible for our actions—period. The villains must be found and brought to justice, but the suffering of more innocent people must not be entertained in the course of that goal—not least the suffering of the already downtrodden, humiliated and mistreated powerless masses of Afghanistan and its neighbours. There is a great duty of care on President Bush and his administration to ensure that only the guilty are punished, for otherwise the injustice of Tuesday will be extended.

I applaud America’s place in the progress of human history but, like those of every other supreme power before it, America’s decision makers are human and fallible. Prime Minister Howard is right to express solidarity with the people of this friendly nation in their hour of anguish, but he must give no blank script to any other politician of any other nation for Australian policies or actions in the future, particularly unspecified policies and actions which come out of this sorry affair. It is the responsibility of our government to be prudent as well as strong in the weeks, months and years ahead. The world’s most powerful nation is talking of war. Its President is talking of war. This is the time for allies to extend not only a helping hand but also a word of timely and appropriate restraint. This is a time, as Kofi Annan put it on day one last Tuesday, for cool heads; otherwise, history will judge more than the terrorists harshly.

Last week’s diabolical episode shows that power and justice are not the same thing; that power without justice brings misery. It will be a measure of the maturity of the world that the response demanded by Tuesday’s inexcusable destruction of innocents does not involve more of the same. The world grieves for the thousands who have died. We must work to ensure that that grief is assuaged by justice according to our own principles rather than compounded by a vengeance emulating that of the perpetrators.

This motion involves a deep condolence to those who have suffered from last Tuesday, and I totally endorse it. However, points (6) and (7) of the motion also involve Australia giving backing to the use of force in unspecified ways by the President of the United States. Let us remember that the President has been given the right to judge who is guilty and then to act against them by the almost unanimous—there was one disserter—decision of the United States Congress. I believe that it would be judicious for this nation to take part as warranted according to our own judgment and not to be in the business of transferring that judgment to Washington. I therefore move the following amendment to the motion:

Omit paragraphs (6) and (7), substitute:

(6) Urges world leaders to respond to calls for revenge with calm and reason.

(7) Recognises that unmitigated military retaliation in response to this mass murder
may accelerate the cycle of fear, anger and violence.

(7A) Supports the rule of international law. The perpetrators of these crimes should be brought to justice through the appropriate enforcement of that international law.

(7B) Calls on member states of the United Nations, which have shown swift solidarity of commitment to bringing the terrorists to justice, to immediately instigate action through the United Nations, including military action as necessary, to achieve that aim.

In support of that amendment I would draw honourable senators’ attention to the United Nations charter itself, which effectively means that an attack on any other nation must come through the United Nations itself. We are in a fast-moving world of inevitable globalisation and we are charged to find a rule of international law. We must not find ourselves infringing that law which is already in place. We must build upon it, not infringe upon it. The United Nations is the agency which should coordinate what appears to be the unanimous response of the community of nations in tracking down and bringing to justice those responsible for the terrorism of last Tuesday, involving, as may be necessary, swift military action to that end. But this world will be a safer place if we act as a community of nations through already written international law rather than taking unilateral, bilateral or other action outside the formulations which we have agreed to in the United Nations. I therefore commend this amendment to the Senate and with that amendment included will be supporting the motion.

Senator FERRIS (South Australia) (2.58 p.m.)—As the Chair of the Australia-USA Parliamentary Friendship Group I support the condolence motion before the Senate. There are 65 parliamentary friendship groups in the Australian parliament, of which the Australia-USA group is the largest with 123 members and senators. Our group is proudly bipartisan and over the years has developed a very close working relationship and, indeed, friendship with each of the American ambassadors, members of staff at the American Embassy and the many congressmen, congresswomen and senators who have visited this country since our friendship group was first formed back in 1988.

Parliamentary friendship groups play a very important role in maintaining and strengthening our relationship with nations from around the world. During my term as chair of the friendship group, I have been privileged to enjoy close friendships with three ambassadors: Her Excellency Genta Hawkins Holmes, more recently His Excellency Skip Gnehm, now serving the United States in Jordan, and of course the recently appointed US Ambassador, His Excellency Mr Thomas Schieffler.

In November 1999, I was a member of a parliamentary delegation of members of this chamber who visited New York and Washington. As well as visiting the floor of the New York Stock Exchange, we held a working lunch with senior officers of J.P. Morgan at the Trade Centre. I particularly express my sympathy to J.P. Morgan which had 3,500 workers in the World Trade Centre, of whom several hundred are still missing. On behalf of the friendship group, our sympathies also go to the new ambassador to Australia, and I commend him for the moving speech he made at this morning’s memorial service.

Like everybody else here, last Tuesday night, when wakened by a call from a friend to immediately put on the television, I thought about the safety of many of our young Australians who are living and working in New York and around the Trade Centre. In fact, Sally Rumble, a talented young graphic designer from Canberra and the daughter of a close family friend of mine, was working not very far from the Trade Centre when this terrorist attack took place. She and her colleagues saw this terrible tragedy unfold from the roof of the building in which they worked in Manhattan and, as all the phone lines collapsed in the area for several hours, there was a painful wait for her parents, Max and Inge, who are in the gallery, before it could be confirmed that she was indeed safe. But there are still more than 70 Australians missing. Many of them will be our youngest and most talented people who now are working around the world in the developing industries. Our thoughts are
with their families and their friends. Some of them have already been mentioned in this chamber today.

On behalf of all members of the Australia-USA Friendship Group, as chair I extend my sympathies to all the victims of this terrible tragedy and, of course, the family and friends in the United States and around the world who are affected by this despicable attack. Like everybody else in this chamber and in this country, I look forward to seeing the perpetrators of these vicious crimes being hunted down and brought to justice.

Senator SHERRY (Tasmania) (3.02 p.m.)—There are a few events in our lives that are so dramatic and, in some cases, so horrific that we remember them till the day we die. We remember those images, what we were doing and where we were at that point in time. The walk by Neil Armstrong on the moon, the invasion of East Timor and its subsequent freedom, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Sydney Olympics and, last week, the terrorist attack on New York and Washington will all be carried in my memory till the day I die. To view the extraordinary live TV coverage after *Lateline* last week, watching planes in suicide bomb attacks, my thoughts firstly went to the hundreds of passengers and crew who were in those planes. As the skyscrapers collapsed like a pack of cards, my thoughts went to the thousands of individual human beings who were being crushed alive and to the hundreds of emergency service personnel who died under that falling rubble—5,000 human lives gone and, amongst them, 69 missing Australians. My extreme sadness, my heart, goes to the thousands who lost their lives, to their families, to their friends and to their colleagues.

The United States is entitled to seek justice. Such justice must be proportionate, based on the evidence that is available. If, as appears likely, the perpetrators are motivated by Islamic fundamentalism, they are a tiny minority of that religion. History is filled with examples of terror carried out by a few in the name of their religion. To give but a few examples: the crusaders when capturing Jerusalem in 1099 slaughtered every Muslim in the city and burnt the Jews alive in the synagogue; Saladin, when he recaptured the city 100 years later in the name of Islam, did not kill one human being; the Inquisition; more recently, the Hindu extremists blowing up mosques in India; and the Catholic and Protestant civil war in Northern Ireland. History is filled with extremism carried out in the name of a person’s religion.

The President of the United States, George Bush, has been considered in his response and two themes in particular are important. He has clearly announced the determination of the United States to seek direct justice by military means. Going further, he has sought the international cooperation of well over 100 countries and indicated the United States more actively participating in the various forums of the United Nations.

In seeking to win a war on terrorism, we must ensure that it is the guilty that are punished and that our goal is a long-term and just peace. Again, history is filled with examples of the winning of a war by military means but leading to a peace that has in turn led to further conflict and repression. The so-called peace of World War I led directly to the rise of Nazi Germany and World War II. The peace of World War II led to the consolidation of the Stalinist regime in the former Soviet Union and the Iron Curtain of a totalitarian repression falling across Eastern Europe for almost half a century. An effective end to terrorism must include dealing with many of its causes—the poverty, the malnourishment, the repression and the rights of ethnic and religious minorities: these are fundamental to tackling the root causes of the terrorist problem.

In my opening remarks I mentioned a number of events that are stamped indelibly in my memory. They are events that highlight both good and evil of humankind. I have no doubt that there is good in all humankind and that good will triumph over evil.

Senator HARRADINE (Tasmania) (3.07 p.m.)—This time last week, I asked my staff for the time difference between New York and Australia. I was in communication with people there preparatory to my going to New York. I should have been in New York today. That fact has added poignancy to the distress and mental anguish that I, along with so
many others, felt after hearing of and view-
ing the effects of the diabolical terrorist acts
perpetrated against persons of 38 nations in

In particular, I feel for our American
brothers and sisters. We need, at this time
especially, to show solidarity with them in
this dark hour. Today we, as a national par-
liament, have the opportunity to publicly
express our sympathy to all of those who
have been affected, to those within Australia
who still have loved ones unaccounted for
and to those of other nations which were
mentioned by the government and the Leader
of the Opposition, particularly to those in
America itself. Our hearts go out to them,
and on behalf of myself, my family and my
constituents, I offer them my sympathy; the
whole of Australia is grieving with you.

Each one of us knows where we were
when we first heard of the developing trag-
dedy. We heard, as accounts came in, of the
disastrous consequences of these diabolical
acts of terrorism. We were horrified by them.
We had a surge of revulsion. So many people
publicly prayed to our compassionate God
for those who have lost loved ones and for
the loved ones themselves. Is it not a reflec-
tion on our capacity for free will that the
creator must place such great importance on
the dignity of each individual human being
that an individual human being can reject
that and still have free will? This great mys-
tery is at the heart of human life and human
actions.

The response that came from the commu-
nity in the United States and here was imme-
diate and generous. The response involved
wonderful sacrifices. The goodness came out
of people in their self-sacrificing service to
others. So many people responded to the call
for public prayer for the victims, for the
loved ones, for the emergency crews, for
anyone who was affected by the tragedy and
for the leaders of the free world.

As has been said before in this discussion,
we have faced and we are still facing some
of the darkest days in our history. In facing
those darkest hours, we do need to have
hope. We must pray for a resolution of this
problem and guidance for the US President
in particular. There will be a temptation to
use huge firepower.

On the day after the attacks I was asked
about it. I expressed profound sympathy to
the United States of America and its people.
I said:

All the people that I have seen and met this
morning have said their thoughts and prayers are
with the victims of this diabolical act of terrorism.
We need a renewed commitment to stamp out
terrorism, which threatens civilisation and free
societies everywhere. But we cannot allow these
evil acts to plunge the world into a climate of war.
This would play into the hands of the perpetrators
of the diabolical acts of terrorism.

Yes, there will be those temptations. There
will be temptations to exercise powers which
will restrict the freedom of our societies. But
in this tragic hour, we need to reflect how
effectively our free societies contribute to
genuine human flourishing. I am sure all
colleagues around this chamber would agree
that that is our objective—to enhance human
flourishing.

George Weigel, whom I have been reading
recently, said that JP II was of the view—and
I agree with it—that free societies will con-
tribute to genuine human flourishing only if
democracy and the market are disciplined by
a vibrant public moral culture founded in
shared public convictions about moral truth.
People then can discern good from evil, right
from wrong, justice from injustice, et cetera.

We need to uphold this in any response
that arises pursuant to the need to stamp out
terrorism of this nature. As has been said in
this chamber, we need to put more resources
into tackling the underlying causes of con-
licts in those areas of the world in which
these are most evident. I refer to one such
example: the Middle East situation—or
‘situations’. These are hotbeds of recruitment
for the fanatical proponents of terrorism. The
last thing that we want—and I am sure the
last thing the Americans want—is a response
to these barbaric acts with a type of barba-
rism of our own. We need to uphold the rule
of law; we must not do anything that would
damage our human flourishing, our free so-
ciety.

It is easy for us to say that here, so many
thousands of kilometres from America,
which has borne the brunt of this terrorism. But I am sure that, with guidance, the leaders of our free societies will respond in an appropriate way, bearing those matters in mind. In Australia, we cannot allow bigotry to flourish—this pointing the finger at Arabs or persons of Islamic faith. President Bush himself said the terrorist acts were perpetrated by people who did not respect human life.

Respect for human life is fundamental to all religions where people believe in one god—the Christian, Islamic and Judaic faiths. We need to ensure that we have that respect for life. It is good to see that America has not responded to the terrorist attacks by isolationism. The Americans have the power; they could stand and say, ‘We will turn inward; we will make sure our borders are secure. Nothing like this would happen; the rest of the world can paddle its own canoe.’ America has not taken that view, and it should be respected and supported.

I am pleased to stand here and support this motion. It is a very vital motion, and I hope that our actions and those of the free world will be seen by generations to come as having been to stand up for life.

Senator SANDY MACDONALD (New South Wales) (3.21 p.m.)—I want to join other senators in expressing our condolences to the United States and to the United States people by this Senate resolution. I want to express my heartfelt sympathy to those who lost family and friends on Tuesday of last week. Like everybody else, I was instantly paralysed by the horror of the events in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania. Like many senators, I have been to the top of the World Trade Centre, and the magnitude of the bricks and mortar damage alone puts this brutal act in perspective. For no reason, and without warning, thousands of innocent people have had their lives changed forever and needlessly. Children have lost parents; parents have lost children. No country, Australia included, has escaped this horror.

I want to take particular note of the missing Australians, of whom there are about 70. I extend my strongest feelings of sympathy and empathy to the families of the three Australians who are reported in the media as having lost their lives: Mrs Kennedy, Mr Dominguez and Chris Porter from Brisbane. To those families, I say godspeed and God bless. I hope that their loved ones did not suffer the horror of their untimely deaths slowly or in agony. To those other Australian families waiting for news, I hope it is good when it comes.

Australians stand by the American people in this time of crisis. The United States of America is a great provider of good and balance in the world. It is the remaining superpower. The Americans always do what they think is best. Sometimes they may make mistakes, but the world and Australia would miss them if they were not there pursuing what they see as fair and decent.

America has an unparalleled record of extending its hand to people and countries that need assistance. I was reminded by my mother on the weekend that she and probably millions of other people in Europe would have starved during World War II if it had not been for the US food parcels that crossed the Atlantic to war-torn Europe. American assistance has been given in so many ways, across the gamut of humanitarian and military aid, over the last 100 years. It is a fantastic nation and the welcoming shadow of the Statue of Liberty has been thrown over millions of displaced people who went to the New World to build the most powerful nation on earth.

I want to make two final points. Firstly, the hate that must be burnt into the souls of those who carried out these acts and of those who harboured them is impossible for us to comprehend. But comprehend it we must—otherwise, we too will become its continuing victims. Secondly, the military response must be certain, it must be sustained and it must be determined to root out the perpetrators of this terrorism. These people must be punished. The world must be protected against them. America has the resources to do this. Australia will support it, both morally and to the military level that we can. God bless America.

Senator LUDWIG (Queensland) (3.25 p.m.)—I rise today not only on behalf of myself and the Labor senators here today but also on behalf of Senator Gibbs, Senator McLucas, and Senator Hogg from Queen-
sland. I rise to express my support for this motion and to say to the people of the United States of America, particularly those that have lost friends, brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, children or work colleagues, that the thoughts and prayers of my fellow Queenslanders are with them all during these most difficult times.

Like most Australians, I woke up on the morning of 12 September—a date I am sure will always remain black and infamous in our collective memories—to witness on television the utterly despicable acts of terrorism taking place in New York and Washington. No words can express the horror I felt as I witnessed the destruction of the World Trade Centre and the attack on the Pentagon. No words can express the sorrow I felt as I witnessed the terrible suffering and loss of human life caused by these cowardly acts. No words can express my anger and revulsion towards those who organised and committed these cowardly attacks.

As the tragic results of these attacks have become more clear during this week, I can assure the people of the United States of America that the feelings of horror, revulsion and anger felt by my fellow Queenslanders on witnessing the television images of this tragic event have not diminished. Indeed, if anything, these feelings have become stronger and more focused. We must all realise that these attacks were not just against the World Trade Centre, the Pentagon or indeed against the United States of America. These were deliberate attacks against very powerful symbols of democracy and a country that is itself a powerful symbol of democracy. These attacks were designed to strike at the heart of all Western democracies that respect freedom and are governed by the rule of law. If these attacks were an attempt to damage or somehow change our view towards freedom and democracy, then these attacks will have failed.

Will the world change of the result of these cowardly attacks? Yes, in my view, sadly it will. The way we go about our travel will change; the way we go about securing our nation will change. But will our respect for democracy or our love of freedom change? I can say, on my behalf: no, it will not. If anything, the events of the past week have shown us that, as stated by the Premier of Queensland, the Hon. Peter Beattie:

Democracy is like a fragile flower. It has to be protected.

These events have clearly demonstrated that there is no place for terrorism in this world. Far too many innocent people, who did nothing more than go to work, have lost their lives in New York and Washington because someone, somewhere, wanted to make a political statement. It is important for us to make it clear to the world that acts of terrorism are not political statements but acts of murder against the innocent. The people who perpetrated these attacks must be brought to justice. No stone should be left unturned in determining who is responsible for these crimes, not just those who committed the individual acts of terrorism but those who have harboured, sponsored or protected them. Once found, these people must be brought to justice.

It must be demonstrated that there is no place in our world for those who commit mindless acts of terrorism. The people and the government of the United States of America are to be commended for the way in which they banded together during this crisis. The images conveyed to us of the thousands of volunteers struggling in the shattered remains of the World Trade Centre to recover survivors showed the determination and compassion of the American people. The courage of the police and fire and rescue crews, many of whom were tragically killed in the line of duty, should be an inspiration to us all. I am sure that the thoughts and prayers of all Queenslanders are with them and their families.

The people and government of the United States of America should also be commended for their patience and restraint. In those first horrific hours after the destruction of the World Trade Centre, it would have been very easy indeed to lash out. Instead, the American government and people concentrated on rescue efforts and on conducting a proper investigation into these attacks. I am sure that these investigations will uncover information that will bring to light the perpetrators of these barbaric acts. Once this has
been done, those responsible can be brought to justice.

It is also important to remember that this is not just an American tragedy. The World Trade Centre was the workplace of many people from many nations. As we meet here today, we should acknowledge that there are few countries that have not been touched by the pain of loss from this attack. Indeed, there were many Australians present at the World Trade Centre at the time of this cowardly attack and, sadly, many are still listed as missing. Again, the thoughts and prayers of my fellow Queenslanders are with them.

On a private note, this tragedy has extended its reach to all places. We have heard a number of speakers mention that Andrew Knox is missing. My sorrow goes to his family—his parents, Tom and Marion, and his brother, Stuart. I had the pleasure, some years ago now, to work with Andrew in the union movement in Queensland. He was one of the first ACTU recruiters attached to the Australian Workers Union. He spent some time in Brisbane and then in Cairns working for the union movement and gaining experience and many valuable skills. Queensland could not retain him. I recall that his love was for South Australia and his family, and he returned there. Andrew Knox sadly was not alone at the World Trade Centre. This is clearly an enormous tragedy for Australia as well. Words do not do justice to the scale of these events, and they cannot alone comfort those who have been touched by these events, nor do they fill the void left in our hearts by these events.

In closing, I once again express to the people of the United States of America the condolences of the people of Queensland. We all share in the sorrow and anger of your loss. Our thoughts and prayers are with you.

Senator BOURNE (New South Wales) (3.33 p.m.)—Under normal circumstances—and obviously these are not—we would have been shocked and horrified hearing about a passenger flight crashing into the ground in Pennsylvania, killing 44 people, and moved by the immense bravery of those on board who ensured that no further lives were lost, and we would have seen that as a very significant tragedy for the world. But these are extraordinary circumstances when we add to that another passenger jet crashing into the Pentagon, with 190 people feared dead, and then the almost unbelievable and certainly overwhelming figure of 5,000 people feared dead at the World Trade Centre. Like other senators, I was awoken very late that night and told to watch the television, which I did. I could not believe it. It seemed like a very bad movie was on and that some very clever graphic designer had designed something that looked all too real. Unfortunately, it was all too real. There was immense bravery shown by those plane passengers, by fire crews and the police, many of whom are now dead, and by rescue workers, who are still at the scene in New York. Officials are saying that it will probably take another two months just to clear the World Trade Centre site and to make it safe before anything else can start.

What all those people had to have in common was cool heads. They were all very sensible in their reactions. Obviously, those cool heads will now be needed beyond those sites. They will be needed by all world leaders in deciding what to do next. I understand that nothing has been decided yet, and I think it is very sensible to wait and to get as much evidence as is humanly possible before anything is decided. We have to remember that Australia has lived through a lot of quite significant and quite terrible disasters—the Port Arthur massacre, the Ash Wednesday bushfires, Cyclone Tracy, the Newcastle earthquake, the Thredbo disaster and Australia’s involvement in wars overseas. They all stand out as terrible tragedies that Australians have lived through. Our sense of community got us through those terrible tragedies in the past. When you look at this tragedy and the number of Australians likely to have lost their lives in the World Trade Centre, it rates as one of the biggest Australian tragedies that we have ever had. I think our sense of world community will get us all through this, even though we all feel absolutely overwhelmed at the moment.

Justice has to be done and has to be seen to be done, but justice also has to be proportional and has to be seen to be proportional. How do we stop these terrorist attacks from happening? There has been a lot of com-
mentary about that lately, and I think almost all of it has been very sensible and very reasonable. I remember in particular James Wolfensohn this morning saying that we now have to go back and look with a new sense of urgency at poverty and desperation around the world, at the disparity of wealth between rich countries—and of course America is seen as the richest of them all, and probably the World Trade Centre was seen as the symbol of that wealth—and the vast majority of people in the world who are living in desperation, who are poor and who feel that that does not need to be. It does not need to be. We do have to look at that. He is absolutely right in what he says there.

I have also seen studies that show that tolerance and dissent are actually the avenues to growth and advancement in civilisations, that societies that crush dissent breed fanatics and that ultimately they disintegrate. That surely has to be a lesson for all of us. It has to be a lesson for all of us in this parliament, as well as for everybody else around the world. These fanatics are bred by a lack of tolerance and the crushing of dissent.

I agree overwhelmingly with almost all of today’s motion of the government, but I was a bit shocked to see part 7. I was a bit shocked to see something which could be construed to mean that Australia is giving an open-ended agreement to any commitment of troops—or to anything else. I hope to goodness that it does not mean that, and I know that very substantial numbers of people in the Australian community would not agree with that. But I think almost everybody in the Australian community would agree with parts 1 to 5 and with part 8—Senator Brown does not agree with part 6—and I even agree with part 6. I have read the ANZUS treaty and I think it is just a statement of fact, and this commits us to carrying that out.

As a consequence, Madam President, I ask that you consider standing order 84(3) when you put this motion today and that you consider removing parts 6 and 7. I think it would be a huge pity if the condolence, sympathy and horror that is being expressed in parts 1 to 5 and the tolerance and inclusion that is being expressed in part 8—I know every member of this Senate will agree with all of those, but from listening to Senator Brown and others I know that they do not agree with part 7—were construed to mean that there is an open-ended agreement by this Senate to any troop commitment by Australia. If that were the case, I would not agree with it, either. I ask that you please put those parts of the motion which I know will have absolutely overwhelming and wholehearted support separately to those parts of the motion that do not. I think that would be far more appropriate.

I end by noting that all those people who died—and heaven knows there were thousands and thousands of them—were going about their daily business. They were just people going to work, people going out to get breakfast and people who were travelling to other parts of the country. We are all absolutely and utterly shocked, horrified and overwhelmed that people just going about their daily business could suddenly lose their lives in this way. I know that the response to this will not involve more of that. It will not involve more people who are just going about their daily business, who have no involvement in any terrorism or anything else, suddenly dying. I believe that that will not be the case, and I fervently hope that that belief will be justified in the days to come.

Senator ELLISON (Western Australia—Minister for Justice and Customs) (3.40 p.m.)—In supporting this motion, I take the opportunity to offer my condolences to the American people and particularly the American families who have suffered such terrible loss in recent attacks in the United States of America. These murderous acts of terrorism were perpetrated without explanation and were unaccompanied by manifesto. They were acts designed solely to achieve the greatest damage and loss of human life possible, but they had no specific result in mind, other than mass murder—which they perpetrated. There is no justification for these actions, which are inexplicable, and there can never be any sympathy for the individuals behind these acts of indiscriminate terror. Our solidarity with the United States, with its opposition to terrorism and its commitment to eradicating these indiscriminate acts of
ruthless terror, is solidarity with all those who desire the continuation of civilised life.

It is also with great sadness that we acknowledge the loss of Australians in this tragedy, and of course we offer our condolences to the loved ones and families of those who have been lost. In particular, our concern and sympathy goes to those families and loved ones who are waiting on news of those Australians who remain missing. They are all in our thoughts and prayers. The terrible loss of Australian life reminds us that this was an attack not just on the American city of New York and on the Pentagon but on the entire civilised world. This week’s Age listed the international roll call of nations who have lost the lives of their citizens as some 28, and I believe this number is climbing.

In Australia, immediate measures had to be taken in relation to the security of various people and interests in this country, and I take this opportunity to thank the men and women of the various law enforcement agencies in my portfolio of justice and customs. In particular, the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Protective Service and the Protective Security Coordination Centre worked quickly and professionally to put the necessary security measures in place. The PSCC brought together all Commonwealth agencies concerned and maintained an Australia-wide response by coordinating the National Anti-Terrorist Plan response. National crisis management arrangements with regard to Australia’s counter-terrorist measures were also put in place immediately. At very short notice following the incident in New York, the Australian Federal Police and the Australian Protective Service provided additional protection to Australians and to United States, United Kingdom and Israeli interests around Australia.

On being notified of the terrorist attack on the World Trade Centre in New York, the Australian Federal Police also immediately implemented an emergency response in accordance with its responsibilities to ensure the safety of Australian citizens and diplomatic premises. This is one part of the AFP’s ongoing role in national security planning and in the evaluation of risks to Australia. Immediate liaison and assistance commenced with Australia’s intelligence community, and the AFP continues to provide intelligence and information. The Australian Federal Police has a protocol with the FBI and is coordinating the large number of inquiries with state and Commonwealth partners.

As the Prime Minister has stated, the terrorist attacks in the United States constitute an attack upon not only that country but also Australia, within the terms of articles IV and V of the ANZUS Treaty. Just as Australia has declared its commitment to a military response, so too has Australian federal law enforcement committed itself to the search for those responsible. The Australian Federal Police, particularly, is working closely with the FBI and will offer every assistance to the FBI in the search for those responsible for these terrible acts.

The rule of law is absolute, and Australia will play its part in seeing that those who perpetrated these acts are brought to justice. The fight against international terrorism requires international cooperation between legitimate law enforcement agencies. Australian law enforcement remains totally committed to this cause, and we will do all that is proper to see that justice is brought to bear on those people who committed these atrocious acts. There is an old saying that ‘bad things happen when good men and women stand by and do nothing’. In this case, action is required, and that action will be carried out in an appropriate manner by Australian law enforcement.

Senator LUNDY (Australian Capital Territory) (3.45 p.m.)—I rise to speak on behalf of Territorians, including those in my electorate in the ACT and those in the external territories. I understand that my colleague Senator Crossin will be speaking on behalf of Australians from the Northern Territory. The terrorist attack on America is a tragedy of almost incomprehensible consequences, and we are all struggling to put into words just how we feel and what this means to us as individuals, communities, nations and indeed humankind. The human tragedy, the loss of thousands of innocent lives, has shocked all of us to the core. The events of
11 September will change forever the way in which we perceive our world.

I wish to extend my personal condolences to the families and friends of all those killed in the tragedy. I especially want to extend my deepest sympathy to the families and friends of the many Australians whose lives have been shattered by this attack. As we pause to remember and reflect on these events, it still does not seem real or possible. But the awful truth is that this act was real and it was planned and carried out in a manner that is truly despicable. It barely seems believable that human beings can rationally and meticulously set out to destroy so many innocent lives. Last Tuesday we all experienced a shared grief and a shared sense of loss, and this collective spirit has now brought us together.

Australia may be a long way from the US geographically but emotionally, culturally and politically we are very close, and it is that special closeness that makes this most deplorable act an attack on Australian values, on our beliefs and on our society as well. The fact that there are still so many Australians lost and yet to be accounted for does make this specifically an attack on Australia. We are not alone in this regard: people from some 40 nations around the world have suffered loss and are missing many more. Australia, being a truly multicultural society, feels deeply for all of these nations and every person touched by this tragedy.

Many Australians have chosen America to be their home, have been posted there for professional reasons or have family and friends around the New York and Washington areas. I know that here in parliament many of us have had the privilege of visiting the United States and cities such as New York and Washington, DC. I am one to whom that privilege has been extended. One of the more emotional scenes last week was seeing colleagues and staff members awaiting emails confirming that their friends were okay and accounted for. I do not know that there is one person in Australia who has not been touched at least to one or two degrees by people directly experiencing this tragedy.

The fact that a few brave people were able to make contact through mobile phones from their hijacked planes played a vital role in preventing further tragedy. It breaks everybody’s heart as these stories continue to pour out. I understand that passengers alerted about the attacks in New York may have prevented the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania from hitting its intended target. Unfortunately, we will never be able to personally reward the heroics of those passengers.

The Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade says that two Australians who phoned their families from the World Trade Centre after the first plane crashed have not been heard of since. I cannot imagine how those families feel. I cannot imagine the immense relief felt by those families and friends when they received that first phone call telling them that everything was okay, only to suffer later and never hear from them again. These family members and friends will relive that moment over and over for the rest of their lives, along with every word exchanged during that final phone conversation. For those Australians still unaccounted for, their families will no doubt keep waiting for a phone call.

Following the horrific terrorist attacks, email and the Internet became essential tools in helping friends and relatives from all over America and around the world make contact with loved ones. The World Wide Web has allowed stories to be shared and accounts to be given so that everybody can get a sense of just what has occurred. Through that proliferation of information, I think that we have actually come closer; the tragedy that occurred has touched us more closely, more personally.

It is also time now to reflect on the fire, police and ambulance officers who have lost their lives in this tragedy. These people devoted their working lives to servicing the community and those in need. These people lived modest lives and went to work every day with the knowledge that their lives were potentially in danger, something which bonds service personnel throughout the world. I would like to praise and honour the firefighters and police of New York and the Tristate area, whose efforts this week have been overwhelming and also, in recognising them, the hundreds upon hundreds of volun-
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teers who have just come out to lend a hand in whatever way they possibly can.

I know the memories of the officers and emergency service personnel who died last week will live on in the memories of their Australian comrades. My heart goes out to all service personnel here and around the world and also to their families who kiss them goodbye every morning. I am reminded of their deep commitment to the safety of the community, and that makes me realise how easy it is to take for granted those who make the choice of a professional career in emergency services. Their lives are at risk, and how unfortunate it is that so many of them paid the ultimate price for that commendable choice in New York and Washington.

The increased security at Parliament House and at official establishments around the world is most welcome. I would like to acknowledge the security staff here at Parliament House for their ongoing efforts and for a job always well done. Many staff members have spoken to me about the need for increased security, particularly in the car parking areas that are not normally protected. It is a sad day when our own safety and security needs to be upgraded, as has been the case with so many establishments around the world. It also reminds me that it is not just about established institutions around the world but innocent civilians being attacked and so many of them losing their lives without having any expectation day by day of the risk in going to their jobs. I acknowledge those young Australians, embarking on a promising and bright career in the ‘city that never sleeps’—New York—who have had their lives tragically cut short.

Whilst the world debates the merits of how to deal with terrorists, there is no doubt that we must act to prevent further threats, either here or abroad. A positive outcome is not police states and infringements on privacy but preservation of our way of life and a continuing value on and protection of our civic liberties. I cannot imagine the devastation caused by a similar incident in Australia. Our hearts go out to everyone affected by the tragic attacks in the United States, and I look forward to a day when all cultures can live in harmony, and humanity finds a peaceful means to resolve its disputes.

Senator HARRIS (Queensland) (3.55 p.m.)—I rise to speak this afternoon as we meet in this place aware of the events that occurred in the United States of America on 11 September. Many questions will pass through our minds as we reflect on that horrific day. I wish to add my personal condolences and those of Queenslanders and all Australians to the Australian families, all Americans and those of all other countries who have lost their loved ones. I would like to quote from a piece of scripture, John 3:16: For God so loved the world that he gave his only son so that everyone who believes in him may not die but have eternal life.

We need to reflect upon those service personnel who freely gave their lives to save others. Greater love hath no man or woman that lays down their life for a friend. Primarily we must see all acts of evil in this world as an act of evil against God and his moral laws, as contained in the Ten Commandments and in the law of love; that is, the Gospel in Jesus Christ. Those involved in this act of evil will ultimately respond to God for their deeds. Psalm 37:28 states: For the Lord loves the just and will not forsake his faithful ones. They will be protected forever, but the offspring of the wicked will be cut off.

Secondly, God has established governments to be his administrators of justice and to punish evildoers. In 1 Peter 2:13 we read: Submit yourselves for the Lord’s sake to every authority instituted among men: whether to the king, as the supreme authority, or to governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. However, these verses may not sufficiently on their own give an answer as to why this event happened in a world ruled by a loving and sovereign God. God’s sovereignty and individual human responsibilities are two facts that we cannot deny. Every person involved in this event had or has a personal responsibility before God. Although these events were carried out under God’s sovereign rule of his creation, God is not the author, as the primary motive, of these
events. They were brought into play by the specific personal choice of those involved.

It may help us at this point in time to compare this event with the most horrific event in human history, the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. As awesome as these events in the USA are, with the tragedy and suffering they have brought to many, the crucifixion of Christ is the tragic event of human history, for in this event we see much anguish of soul and suffering. He was unrecognisable, and there was such fury and anger. He was bruised for our sins, as never before nor will ever be seen again in human history. Yet out of this greatest of human tragedies there comes hope for mankind and salvation, for all who will trust in God through Jesus Christ. In Psalm 62:1 we read:

My soul finds rest in God alone, my salvation comes from him.

What then do we say of God’s justice? Will this evil event go unnoticed or unpunished by God? Psalm 73 helps us to understand the wicked, their evil ways and eventual end before God. In Psalm 73:13-14 we read:

Surely in vain have I kept my heart pure; in vain have I washed my hands in innocence. All day long I have been plagued ... And in Psalm 73:16-19 we read:

When I tried to understand all this, it was oppressive to me till I entered the sanctuary of God; then I understood their final destiny. Surely you place them on slippery ground; you cast them down to ruin. How suddenly are they destroyed, completely swept away by terrors!

Primarily, it is up to God alone to judge those involved in this horrific event and to deal with them as his will dictates. Yet this judgment may be acted out through lawfully established governments that honour God and follow his laws of heaven. As Ariel Sharon said:

This act of evil is against the laws of heaven; and the gospel which we hold.

In concluding, I believe that as a Christian nation our thoughts and prayers must also turn to forgiveness for those who have committed this diabolical act.

Senator WATSON (Tasmania) (4.02 p.m.)—Last Tuesday evening many people throughout the world watched their television screens in horror as a devastating, unbelievable scenario unfolded before their eyes. As one event followed another, the overwhelming extent of the terrorist attack left the world in shock, with people from over 40 nations, including 70 from Australia, perishing in New York, Washington and rural Pennsylvania. Australians have been deeply touched by this dramatic tragedy. Having visited Robert Shepler, the Managing Director of Salomon Smith Barney Asset Management, and his staff only three months ago in one of the twin towers in New York’s World Trade Centre, these tragic events have come so close to home. Fortunately, all the Salomon Smith Barney staff, apart from four who were visiting offices higher up in the towers, escaped. My sympathy goes to those who lost their lives.

There have been many stories of heroism and hope amid scenes of despair. We have heard reports of a Catholic priest losing his life as he gave the last rites to a victim. Another man lost his life as he stayed and comforted an injured colleague, and two people carried a disabled stranger down 68 flights of stairs to safety. With over 5,000 souls missing, so many lives have been affected, either directly or indirectly. One British company is reported to have lost something in the vicinity of 100 of its workers at the World Trade Centre. How many years of experience and expertise that represents is hard to imagine.

What words are there to express the government’s horror at these terrorist attacks? Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to those affected, both far and near, and to all those rescue workers who have worked for hour upon hour in the hope of finding someone else alive. I was particularly touched to see the construction workers in New York downing tools and going to the scene in order to offer their help. These men were not trained in rescue work but they did have something to offer: it was their strength and willingness to help.

This dreadful act reaches out further than those directly involved. It is an attack against the whole civilised world itself, including
Australia. It is an attack against all we stand for, all we have worked for since the first settlers arrived here more than 200 years ago. The overwhelming feelings we all, including the leaders of this government, have had in these last few days have resulted in the ANZUS Treaty being invoked. This has put us in readiness to assist the United States government in whatever way we can. However, we Australians, along with the rest of the world, do need to move carefully in order to provide an international, appropriate and measured response to this situation. The United States is up against a shadow. It is claimed evidence points to Osama bin Laden, but he has denied responsibility. Where do we look now? This is a modern form of guerrilla warfare which could strike anywhere in the world. We need to keep vigilant to our own security and to avoid actions that could escalate the problem. We need to remember the words of the Right Reverend Jack Knapp from the service today in the Great Hall of Parliament House, that is, we need to remember that the perpetrators of this dreadful attack are neither Christians nor Jews nor Muslims. They are people with no faith in a god. How can they have any faith in a god, when they have taken so little account of innocent lives? We must take care to ensure that we ourselves are not found wanting in this way.

Today in the Great Hall of Parliament House almost 3,000 people participated in an interdenominational service of commemoration and thanksgiving, honouring the lives of victims of terrorism attacks in the United States. It was indeed a moving ceremony, with barely a dry eye in the packed hall. His Excellency the Hon. J. Thomas Schieffer, Ambassador of the United States, acknowledged in a very personal tribute the closeness of our two nations at this time of national disaster.

Churches have opened their doors so that people can respond in a spiritual way, praying for justice, peace and a speedy recovery for the injured and seeking comfort and strength for the surviving families and friends. I was privileged to attend one such service in Launceston, led by the Reverend Richard Temby. This was not in a cathedral or a place of mass mourning but in a simple suburban church where dozens of people offered their prayers. At times of great grief, nations turn to the great architect of the universe, their God and their saviour. Our government has taken the right step, I believe, in committing to the United States-led action for an appropriate and measured response which will seek out the perpetrators and punish them, as the world must not be held hostage to these sorts of acts of terrorism. In conclusion, I wish to convey to the American people through this Senate a deep sense of condolence and support, on behalf of my Tasmanian constituents. I thank the Senate.

Senator SCHACHT (South Australia) (4.07 p.m.)—I rise to support the motion. Last Tuesday evening, Australian time, I, as President of the Australian Volleyball Federation, had a very joyous occasion to attend: a victory dinner held in a restaurant in Canberra for Australia’s magnificent young women’s team, who had just qualified for the first time in 20 years to go to next year’s world championships. As I was driving home with the radio on, I wondered why CNN voices were coming over the ABC radio, and then I realised that something extraordinary had been happening. I pulled in here to Parliament House and discovered that the security staff at the Senate entrance were watching the monitor showing the burning towers. I went to my room, turned on the television and, like most Australians, stayed transfixed by the horror for the next three or four hours. To say that this is a moment that one will never forget is an understatement. Those of us who are old enough always remember where we were when we heard that President Kennedy had been assassinated or when the Whitlam government had been sacked, but none of these things compare with the sheer horror of watching two towers, 110 storeys tall, collapsing to the ground live on television as though you were watching a Steven Spielberg disaster movie, except that you knew that there were thousands of people who had lost their lives at that moment.

This is not just an American tragedy but a world tragedy. As others have said here today, 30 to 40 countries have lost citizens in this terrorist act, this terrorist disaster, in
America. So far, it looks like well over 70 Australians have lost their lives. In Australian terms, this is the biggest civilian disaster of loss of life, where someone has murdered people, in our history. There have been bigger disasters and accidents—such as coal-mining disasters—but there has been no other incident that has matched the loss of life. I suppose the Port Arthur massacre in 1996, when 35 people were killed, is the only incident that comes close. So this is an Australian tragedy, as much as it is an American tragedy, that so many of our citizens have lost their lives.

As a South Australian senator, it comes home to you within two days that this is a personal disaster when you find that one of the people who lost their lives is known to you personally. Others have mentioned Andrew Knox, a South Australian. I remember Andrew Knox putting his name forward to be the preselected candidate for the Labor Party for the seat of Makin in the coming federal election. He withdrew to take the opportunity to travel overseas and take the job at the World Trade Centre. If he had stayed in South Australia, he may well now be aiming to be the next member for Makin and being in this parliament within two months, speaking on behalf of the people of the Makin electorate, where he grew up and has many friends. Instead, we are now giving him his epitaph. To his mother and father, Tom and Mary, and his brother, Stuart, all of us pass on our deepest sympathies and condolences in what must be a terrible moment for them in losing a son of such quality and calibre.

We also pay tribute to the brave firemen and firewomen, policemen and policewomen and other service and security people who first of all risked their lives and then, in many cases, lost their lives in trying to save people in the World Trade Centre. We have all since seen the photographs of extraordinary scenes in New York and Washington of people paying their condolences to these people. It shows that in a civil society we all need the public sector and that it should not be decried and belittled. These people do not get paid great sums of money, they spend their whole lives in dedicated service and the best that they will get, we hope, is a reasonable pension after 30 or 40 years of service; but now we see that hundreds of them have lost their lives in providing that service to the American public.

From the evidence now appearing, I also think that we should acknowledge that ordinary Americans tried to do heroic things to stop these incidents occurring. There is evidence emerging that passengers on the aircraft that crashed in Pennsylvania apparently decided, when they knew they were probably going to die, that unarmed they were going to try and take the plane back from the hijackers. It is almost certain now that they paid with their lives and those of the other passengers, but they probably saved several hundred other citizens elsewhere in Washington by the plane not hitting one of the targets. To most of us, it is still incomprehensible that ordinary people could suddenly and dramatically show such heroism despite the fact that they were about to die—that they would still try to stop others being killed. It is unfortunate that we may not ever be able to acknowledge specifically those who tried to save that plane, but we all know that those passengers did save many others.

Whatever the horror of this terrorist act, the reason it resonates so terribly with us is that individually we have now seen, on television at around 1 o'clock on what was Wednesday morning in Australia, the impact on ordinary human beings—people like us—watching as people had a choice to burn to death or jump to their death from the 80th or 90th floor of the World Trade Centre. When they showed the film of these people diving to their deaths, I could not imagine anything worse; I could not imagine the choice that people faced within a matter of a few seconds. In itself, that is more horror than most of us could ever care to account for.

I now turn to why this took place. It is beyond my comprehension, but there is one thing I am startled by and cannot work out. The hijackers took these four planes with technology the equivalent of what we in Australia call a Stanley knife and what Americans call a cardboard cutter. You can buy one for $2 at any hardware shop or newsagents in Australia. Despite all of us in
the modern world having tens, if not hundreds, of billions of dollars of security equipment, of technology, a group of fanatics with a Stanley knife took hold of the planes and then killed over 5,000 people.

The second thing now emerging is that these were not just fanatics with a sudden rush of blood to go out and become suicide bombers, as we have occasionally seen in the Middle East. I point out to the Senate that it has just been reported on the news that today, in Kashmir, a suicide bomber has killed nine Indian policemen. Possibly there is a connection to the same groups that may have been involved in the fanaticism that created this tragedy of last week. So almost every day now fanatics are going to the stage of killing themselves to kill others to make a political point. No matter what America’s response is to the use of military force to punish these fanatics, it is clear that bombing those who are willing to sacrifice their lives may not be the solution—much as that might make all of us feel good.

I find it hard to believe that somebody with a religion, any religion, could calmly and carefully, over 18 months, live in a society, prepare themselves by being trained to fly a plane and then go out and calmly fly a plane into a building as though it was just another act of life. It is astonishing. It also means that, although we all claim God is on our side, unfortunately there are people in the world—whether Christians, Muslims, Hindus or any other religion—who from time to time claim that their view is the only view. We cannot be ‘holier than thou’, to use that phrase.

We have had Christians killing each other in Northern Ireland for a very long time. We have had Sikhs killing Hindus and Hindus killing Sikhs in India. We have had Israelis and Palestinians killing each other with almost unlimited abandon in the Middle East. We have had the massacre in Rwanda, where three-quarters of a million people, not 5,000, have been massacred for ethnic or religious reasons. We have had a million-plus people killed in the Balkans in the last 10 years, again partly because of the madness of religious identification—Catholics versus Orthodox, Orthodox versus Muslim. All we know is that individual, ordinary people have been massacred as a result. I think it does come to the bottom line that there is a very good reason to start saying that, if we want democracy and decency in government, we must separate religion from the way we govern ourselves.

In America—and this awful thing did occur in America—some 140-odd years ago Abraham Lincoln, America’s greatest president in my view, made the shortest great speech in the history of the world to describe democracy. The Gettysburg Address was a dedication to those who lost their lives in that terrible battle. What he said is still as relevant today as our commitment to democracy. In 260-odd words, he said the following:

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot consecrate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Senator LEES (South Australia) (4.20 p.m.)—The indescribable savagery that has claimed so many lives in the United States has shaken the world. Indeed, the world that we woke up to this morning is a very differ-
ent one from the one that we woke to last Monday. I watched with my family as the horror unfolded on Tuesday night, 11 September—a date on the world calendar that now will always be engraved in our memories. We watched with disbelief. We watched with shock and a sense of unreality that, surely, this was fiction, that this could not actually be happening. We waited some six hours for the phone call that was to come to tell us that one of our number was in fact safe, that she had visited the World Trade Centre a few days ago and had moved on. Our thoughts and prayers are now with all of those families and friends who are not going to get that phone call. Our prayers and our deepest sympathy must be with those whose lives have been forever changed by this tragedy. We now must think of those who wait, watch and hope that at least they will be able to say a final farewell to their friends and to members of their family as the aftermath is removed and painstakingly sorted through.

In the very short time that I have, I now want to move quickly to part (7) of this motion. As this reads it is now, unfortunately, a blank cheque. It reads as unlimited support regardless of what the Americans decide to do and how they decide to do it, where they decide to act regardless of any risks that more innocent people may be killed. I have to ask the government and the opposition why in a condolence motion we have, potentially, a commitment to war—and so a potential spiralling down into a cycle of fear, hatred, anger and violence—led by the USA. Indeed, they have declared war, on whom they are not sure. But as we read our papers this morning we see very clearly their intent. We have no detail as to what will be involved for us; we are just supporting them ‘all the way with the USA’.

I want to make it very clear that we cannot ignore terrorism in any of its forms. But we must track down with care those responsible and have some patience. We must also not forget our core values. We must respect human rights and freedoms. We must uphold the sanctity of life and protect our democratic values. We are giving enormous power to one man, as indeed the American parliament has before us, approving a motion and giving President Bush full authority. Now we, apparently without question as to what particularly part (7) means, are lining up as well.

Of course, we must track down the perpetrators and give America and other nations every support in doing that. But we must also look at reducing the root causes of terrorism: poverty, alienation, oppression, corruption and the hopelessness that is felt by so many families when they cannot support, even with basic food, their own. If Afghanistan was bombed, a humanitarian nightmare would follow. We know what life is like there already. For most Afghan people that country is already a place without basic fundamental human rights, particularly for women. There it is frequently a life of poverty, despair and famine, a life without hope. So I cannot in any way support a motion that may in fact be supporting further suffering. I support all other parts of this motion and particularly welcome the addition of part (8). However, I ask under standing order 84 that part (7) be put separately.

Senator MASON (Queensland) (4.25 p.m.)—In rising this afternoon to speak to this motion I am reminded of the words of President Lyndon Johnson, spoken almost 40 years ago soon after another tragic event in the life of America tested that nation’s resolve. He said:

All that I have I would gladly give not to be standing here today.

And so it is again. The horror and the tragedy as well as the hope and triumph of the human spirit are often captured with more brilliance in the simple words of everyday people than in all of the great rhetoric of leaders and politicians. I have before me a letter from one New Yorker to an Australian friend. It reads:

It’s now 10.00 p.m. and we have been going since 8.00 a.m.

Where do I begin to tell you about this day?

We got an early call from the Salvation Army to come in. They took us to what is called “Ground Zero” just across the street from where the World Trade Centre stood.

We stood side by side with America’s finest.
They came in from all over the country. Police, Firemen, Search and Rescue, Construction Workers.

I walked amongst them as they came out of the rubble, handing them cold water, food and giving them someone to talk with. Most of them have been here since Tuesday, many of them have lost part of their team in there. So many of them were just needing someone to talk with and tell of what they had seen.

All day, these guys were saying thank you to me. I would put my arms around them and tell them how proud we all are of them. A few would break down for only a moment. I was so grateful I could be there for them at that moment.

I watched as they brought out the five firemen who were trapped in their truck since Tuesday. Thank God, all were alive.

I saw a policeman brought out who did not make it.

At day’s end, we asked some officers if they could give us a ride back up town. As we drove out, there were about six blocks of people standing on the side of the street with banners reading “Thank you, you are our heroes.” They were clapping and cheering as each vehicle came out. That’s when a tear rolled down my cheek.

Tomorrow, we go back in.

We will continue to help wherever we are needed.

So ends this letter. For the United States of America, a country whose spirit and faith in the future stir the world, and for the people of America, whose soaring optimism, love of freedom and the worship of democracy continue to move and inspire us, I hope for three things. I hope that the American people will rise to the challenge of overcoming destruction, comforting victims and rebuilding lives in the same spirit that has carried their nation forward since its founding: the spirit of hope, of courage and of great enterprise.

I hope that, as the United States readies itself to respond to the gauntlet thrown down by the merchants of terror, the virtues of tolerance and restraint that have bound the American polity and made it the most successful multicultural society on Earth will bind ever more tightly and that Muslim communities within will not suffer as a result of the outrageous misdeeds of the few. And I hope that the great loss of human life will not tempt Americans to lose their humanity. I hope that when a superpower weeps its tears will anoint justice and not water vengeance, that the response will be measured and considered, that the perpetrators and their backers will be hunted down and made to account for their attack but that no more innocent blood will be shed to add to that which has already soaked the ground of Lower Manhattan and the Pentagon.

Finally, my thoughts go out to all of my fellow Australians who lost loved ones. New York, Washington and Pittsburgh might be 15,000 miles from Australia but they will never again be foreign soil to us. Their wounds will be our wounds, their memories will be our memories and their pain will be ours too, because every piece of ground, no matter how small or distant from these shores, upon which Australian blood has been shed will always be a part of Australia.

**Senator COONEY (Victoria) (4.30 p.m.)—**As I enter this debate, I am conscious of not being able to say what I ought to say in the way that I want to say it. Indeed, I am not sure that anybody could do that. But having listened to television coverage of speeches in America, having listened today to speeches in the Great Hall and having listened to the speeches in this chamber, I think some people have come close to saying what ought to be said in the way that they wanted to say it. Indeed, I am not sure that anybody could do that. But having listened to television coverage of speeches in America, having listened today to speeches in the Great Hall and having listened to the speeches in this chamber, I think some people have come close to saying what ought to be said in the way that they wanted to say it and in the way that is most suitable.

I am conscious too that there is a need to make an attempt to say what ought to be said about the events of 11 September and their aftermath. The points I make are points that have been made most eloquently before me.

First of all, we remember those people who were directly affected by these events: the people killed. When I was sitting here listening to the speeches, I was trying to visualise what it would be like if we were sitting in this chamber and a plane suddenly crashed through—what that would mean to us. It would mean death or fearful injury of limb and mind, devastation for our families and indeed devastation for the country, because this is a most symbolic building. So we have the death and destruction that these events brought to people—to living bone and flesh—people who no doubt confidently and with some justification expected a much longer term on earth than they were allowed...
or a much longer term on earth without the pain and suffering that will now come to many of them.

In addition, there is the insult to the buildings and to the cities—in the case of the twin towers of the World Trade Centre, the insult to New York and, in the case of the Pentagon, the insult to Washington, the capital of the United States—and, through those cities, the insult to the nation as a whole. This is a terrible affliction. I think it is proper and right that we, as a Senate and as a parliament, recall those things and express—insofar as it can be expressed—the sorrow that should be common to all who are of the human race. We are all members of the human race. The reference to religion has been strong throughout. Abraham was the father to the three religions based on the great books, one which we call the Bible and the other called the Koran. So when we speak of religion we are speaking of a great tradition. In the case of the three religions—Islam, Christianity and Judaism—we are speaking of religions with a common source which would produce in most common feelings that we would describe as human feelings, as those feelings that make us decent citizens of this world, and as forces for good. I think that is to be remembered.

I think this is a great tribute to the American people. It has been expressed by their President, but I think anybody who was at the service in the Great Hall would say that the ambassador, Mr Schieffer, expressed very well that feeling that we are of common stock and that we should go forward on that basis. It is well then to remember the people killed and injured and those closely connected to them by ties of kinship—whether they be a brother or sister, husband or wife, or grandfather or grandmother—along with other people who lost those associated with them in this destruction which took place on 11 September.

Everybody in the Senate would treasure the opportunity to say things about these events and to join this debate. It was decided that not everybody could do that. The Labor Party decided that one representative from each state should speak. Senator Faulkner spoke movingly on behalf of New South Wales, Senator Sherry on behalf of Tasmania, Senator Ludwig on behalf of Queensland, Senator Lundy on behalf of the territories, Senator Schacht on behalf of South Australia, Senator Cook on behalf of Western Australia and I speak on behalf of Victoria. I put that on record to indicate that everybody at our caucus meeting sought the opportunity to speak but that is not possible. So I feel most privileged to be able to speak on behalf of Victorian members and, indeed, on behalf of Victoria generally.

This is a very sad debate which arises out of terrible and sad events. I do not know how things like this are redressed. It does seem a most awful thing that people are almost powerless to do much about restoring things to how they were. I think that this sense of powerlessness is why people turn to religion and to the concept of God. Some criticisms, very subtly, have been made of that. I am not going to condemn anybody or make any adverse comments at all. I simply say that religion can be a very powerful tool in these circumstances to give people hope, to give people encouragement and to give people the opportunity to return to life in the full sense. Those that are touched are going to be touched in the way that we are all touched when we lose loved ones, when matters that are of great importance to us are torn apart or when symbols that are dear to us are desecrated. While we may not have experienced anything on the scale that is present here, we have all had experiences that have given us some idea of the tragedy that has occurred.

I, along with everybody who has so far spoken today and spoken so eloquently, and in common with many, many people around the world who have spoken about these events, express my sympathy—that sounds a very inadequate word indeed—for those who have suffered. As people have pointed out, these events have touched our shores in a very significant way and have touched the shores of many countries around the world. The response has been common and most moving and most fitting.

Senator RIDEWAY (New South Wales—Deputy Leader of the Australian Democrats) (4.41 p.m.)—I want to share in the voices in expressing my deepest sympa-
thy and condolences to the families and friends of those who lost their lives under such tragic circumstances in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania on 11 September. I also on this occasion condemn such insanity as indefensible. Nothing good ever comes of madness, and justice is rarely ever found in the sad experiences of the ruins of such violence. We of course from time to time may differ, but ultimately we aspire to the same end goals of peace and prosperity and a future for all of our people, for all of our races and, particularly, for all of our young people. We would not wish death upon anybody, but I rest assured that those who have lost their lives under these circumstances have met death with the absolute hope of immortality. Even in the face of discouragement or seeming defeat, I would hope that there remains a confidence to shake it off and stand firm and resolute in our belief of world security, peace and tolerance.

It is in this regard that I wish to strongly voice our concern that it is our moral obligation not just to support our American brothers and sisters but also to call for tolerance and unity within our own nation. In our quest for exacting justice, we should ensure that justice is exact and not indiscriminate. First and foremost, as Australians who pride ourselves on tolerance and cultural diversity, we must condemn swiftly attacks by Australians on Muslim mosques, schools and businesses in the same manner in which we have condemned anti-Semitic comments in this country. Many of our Muslim and Arab friends, not unlike our Jewish friends, are Australian citizens and deserve our support at such a harrowing time. No Australian should feel under threat of abuse or be spat on or be stoned just because they are Muslim. We as Australians pride ourselves on democracy and its fundamental freedoms. Most of all, we must uphold the rule of law and guarantee the rights and freedoms of every citizen in this nation without fear or favour. Tolerance is a global struggle, exacting a requirement that we not vilify people for who they are but take precise action that guarantees punishment to those for the evil deeds that they have done, not just because they resemble someone or are different. Genuine morality is preserved only in the school of adversity. In this regard, let us not be bereft of advocates for tolerance in this nation. Let us be advocates for freedom and democracy, exact justice and tolerance and understanding for all of the members of the family of humanity. I finish by again expressing my deepest sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of those who tragically died.

Senator KEMP (Victoria—Assistant Treasurer) (4.44 p.m.)—I rise to support the condolence motion before this chamber. Never, let me say, have I ever seen a greater unity of purpose in the Senate and, indeed, in this parliament. This is a reflection of the response I believe we are seeing in the wider world community. Today’s headline in the Melbourne Age reads ‘World, US unite in fight against terror’. All of us hope that these appalling events can be dealt with in a timely and quick manner, but history warns us that the battle against evil may be long and difficult. However, it is a battle in which democracy and freedom must ultimately prevail. It is vital that in these testing times we maintain the unity that all of us have spoken about today.

All of us will be able to recall in the years to come where we were when we first heard of the attacks on the World Trade Centre in Lower Manhattan. We switched on the TV and the appalling tragedy unfolded before our eyes. We watched, as the world watched, and saw events so horrifying that they were almost impossible to comprehend—two passenger airliners crashing into skyscrapers filled with people, people jumping to their deaths from the upper floors of those buildings to escape the inferno, the devastating collapse of two of the world’s most massive building structures, another passenger airline crashing into the Pentagon and yet another into a field in Pennsylvania.

We saw remarkable acts of heroism. Hundreds of emergency workers have lost their lives by volunteering to go into places of the greatest danger as they sought to help the thousands of trapped people. It appears, as many have mentioned today, that more than 5,000 people have lost their lives in these attacks. Reports in the press today in-
dicate that some 69 Australians are among those feared dead. Twelve of these people come from my home state of Victoria. This was, I think, the very point that the Prime Minister was making when he said:

And at no stage should any Australian regard this as something that is just confined to the United States. It is an attack upon the way of life we hold dear in common with the Americans.
The thoughts and the prayers of this parliament have appropriately turned to the grieving families of those men and women whose lives were tragically ended by an unspeakable terror. But the search for survivors goes on and, although hope is fading, hope still remains. In this disaster people have found the strength to go on. I was moved to read the story of 25-year-old James Dorney, an Australian who was in the South Tower of the World Trade Centre and survived the attack. As the Herald Sun reported the story of James Dorney:

With 20 flights to go the fit rugby player said he was 'stuffed', but he knew he had to help the older and less healthy ones keep going. He held their hands lifting them in the heat.

Everyone was pulling each other through yelling 'come on', 'let's get out of here', 'just don't give up'.

'I grabbed this girl next to me and said 'we're going to make it'. I didn't actually believe it myself. But it sort of sounded good at the time'.

He went on to say:

I’ll never forget the fire guys going the other way into the building. I was so terrified. They were the bravest most beautiful people.

Like many, I was greatly moved by the address that the American ambassador gave at the memorial service in Parliament House today. Let me quote one extract from his speech:

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 at 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.

But the terrorists ultimately failed. These acts did not, and will not, I believe, crush the spirit of the American people, or of their friends and allies in Australia. As Dr Kissinger said today:

The terrorists have already lost an important battle. In the US, they will face a united people determined to eradicate the evil of terrorism at any cost.

He continued:

All Western democracies have recognised that the assault on America—if unpunished—is a prelude to what can happen even more easily in their own societies.

Australia shall go forward with America and the world community. We stand, as the Prime Minister has said, shoulder to shoulder to defend freedom and rid the world of terror.

The motion before the chamber today shows that the ambassador was right when he said: Australians and Americans march again as brothers and sisters in freedom.

Senator O'BRIEN (Tasmania) (4.50 p.m.)—On behalf of Senator Crowley, who is in New York at the moment, I seek leave to incorporate her contribution in Hansard.

Leave granted.

The document read as follows—

Madam President, I arrived in New York late on Saturday evening. My taxi driver made sure that I noticed the New York skyline by night, especially the twin towers of the World Trade Centre.

On Sunday I walked in Central Park and felt some of the excitement of being in New York.


Lleyton Hewitt won the US Open and came to the Australian consul.

On Tuesday AM, New York stopped! America stopped and the world stopped!

A shocking, appalling, obscene disaster began unfolding before our eyes. We watched on TV. One plane, a possible accident. A second plane – absolutely NOT an accident! - just an overwhelming horror!

Then the first building collapsed, falling in on itself!
Oh, no! Then the second one fell. And the Pentagon was hit.

At first, it was unreal! Between seeing it and knowing it to be real there was a great gap. It was very hard to believe that it was really happening.

I went out to Second Avenue – and out there, there were thousands of people streaming out of the city, quiet and orderly. I asked one young man: “Did anyone order you or direct you to leave?: No, we are just doing it, just going home. I went to work this morning, to the 26th Floor of my building, looked out of the window, as I usually do, and saw the tower on fire, then the second plane hit. I just left work and joined all the others walking out of the city.”

They were sort of stunned, very sombre, sober and dignified.

Another woman told me her relative rang to say that she had got out of the Tower before it collapsed.

After that, the city was empty. It got very quiet – no noise, no traffic, no hustle, no people. An eerie, empty New York City.

Late afternoon, I joined my Parliamentary colleague, Lou Liebermann, Member for Indi and his wife, Marj, my Electorate Assistant, Effy Kleanthi and Senator John Hogg to go to the Australian Consul to help with phones set up to assist Australians and their families.

It was some comfort to be together. It was comfort too, to get phone calls of concern and comfort from many of you at this time.

It was hard to sleep, awful images and imaginings in my brain. Perhaps the worst was using humans as a bomb, then the trade Centre on fire, then collapsing, and the Pentagon.

By now, the surreal sense was being replaced with terrible sadness, a knot of grief and tension in the pit of my stomach.

People ringing – are you OK?

Radios ringing – could you talk to us?

Wednesday – Phones continue ringing through the night and morning.

Radio, friends and now the tragedy of discovering Australian friends amongst the missing.

Visit with a friend and grieve together. Today’s pain is ‘Waiting’ – waiting for news of people saved, waiting for news that never comes, and waiting for things to start again, for the city to begin to work.

All the while, the pictures on TV and out the window of the Mission and down the street, of smoke and dust rising and the occasional stench of burning ash.

The disbelief is completely gone and horrible reality and sadness is settled deep in my soul. We walk in the city. I ask policemen and policewomen I meet, are their families OK? “Yes, but we lost colleagues” – and “Thank you for asking.”

It is still a stunned city and nearly empty one, a solitary car in Park Avenue at midnight.

All trains and buses and tunnels and bridges still shut down.

Another night of nightmares.

Thursday – Lou Liebermann and I go to the Australian Mission early.

E-mails – more messages of concern and comfort – very much appreciated. More evidence too that Australia is weeping, grieving, that there are memorial services. Australians have died and my deepest sympathy is first to their families and relatives. Next we all realise this attack is on USA first and then something wider that includes our country.

Walk home through a city running well below par, sort of desultory and sort of only half hearted, and certainly only the upper part of Manhattan.

A meal together with my colleagues keeps us supported.

Candles and vigils along the streets, flags half-mast – the people of this city do their own grieving and remembering.

Friday – wake to traffic noise. Strange. Things a bit on the move, but still the pictures of the building site. Rain overnight and this morning has dampened the dust but made the rescue work that much harder and more dangerous.

Memorial service in Washington, many, many stories on TV from families, from relatives. Photos, tears, desperate hope but hope is fading fast.

Learn that Monday in our Senate, there will be Memorial Proceedings and that I can send a speech. I am grateful for the opportunity. Telling my account is helpful. Being here has an immediacy that has made the event that much more shocking, more horrible.

What does it all mean? What sense to make of it? First, as the surreal feeling was replaced with the awful, shocking reality and terrible sadness, came the questions - how could this have happened? Then the realisation that all the rules of hijacking and of terrorism have completely changed and for the worse by far. A new terror is in the land.

The very openness and the freedoms and the services we enjoy in USA and Australia are now a probable cause, or contribution to the terrorism.
How much do we tighten up? How much would we then lose? How much are we prepared to pay for future prevention?

Hunting down the perpetrators, rooting out the terrorists was the language of the first day or so. By the end of the week, it has changed to War. And now a different set of words – of patience, of the long duration, for this war.

So many countries have said that this attack on America is an attack on them – on our free world. And all those countries stand united and together in confronting this terrorism.

As any number of countries have said; this terrible act demands accountability and punishment, and it is important to be sure we get the people responsible.

Most important, the loss of security, the loss of confidence, the loss of trust has to be addressed. Getting on with things, getting working again may address the inaction but more is needed to address the pain and suffering and the anxiety. Counselling, comforting, community will all help, and for many so will prayer, and service.

For those directly affected, grieving and support of family and friends, even grief counselling will be needed.

For me, Australia and our Senate must stand implacably opposed to terrorism.

For me, the first priority is to grieve - for all those who have died and to join in the deepest sympathy with their families, friends and relatives – and for their country. I grieve for all the Australians who died. So many of them were our bright, young, energetic, creative men and women, taking their talents overseas and exchanging ideas, broadening their horizons before returning to their country. I grieve for those people, of all ages, from all countries, who died in this disaster.

I grieve for America. I have lived in USA for four years in the 60's, I have known America as home for that time and I weep for the country.

I grieve for Democracy, for freedom and liberty, in all our countries, which have taken such a beating with this terrible attack.

I grieve for our loss of innocence – yet again – and the losses of liberty, security, trust that has followed.

I grieve for whatever it is that drives people to do these unspeakably horrible deeds.

I thank the Senate for the opportunity to contribute to these proceedings. This is mostly a personal account of some of my thoughts and feelings as these hideous events unfolded in the city I have come to live in for three months.

It has been some considerable comfort to be able to speak to family, friends and colleagues and I thank you all for your messages of support. It is a comfort too, to be able to join you today.

I acknowledge the splendid effort of all the people working in the Australian Mission to the United Nations, headed by John Dauth, the Australian Consulate General, headed by Ken Allen and Austrade, headed by Geoff Gray. The staff have been unfailingly supportive and helpful, for the many, many Australians here, and their families, both here and in Australia.

Senator O'BRIEN—I thank the Senate.

Senator ALLISON (Victoria) (4.50 p.m.)—I add my words of deepest regret for the deaths of thousands of Americans, Australians and citizens of so many other countries. Like others, I watched the events unfolding on television in stunned horror and I felt for the victims and their families. It is appropriate that the Senate should pass this motion of condolence for all the reasons put forward by other senators.

I do not wish to detract from the earnestness with which the Senate expresses its deep sorrow and anger, but I feel compelled to speak out about what I think is a great fear amongst Australians that we will be drawn into another terrible and useless war. Item (7) of the motion could be seen merely as a commitment to finding and punishing those responsible, but this is not what I have heard in the rhetoric of the last week. The United States President has said that this is an act of war and that it will be a long and arduous fight. Mr Howard says it is an act of war against Australia too and we have already committed a Navy vessel to the region.

The Prime Minister and Mr Beazley were also quick to say that this attack was a reason Australia’s borders should be more secure against asylum seekers. I think it is illogical and divisive to link these people fleeing from persecution in Afghanistan with the calculated act of unthinkable aggression. These terrorists did not set out in leaky boats. The suicide pilots were free to travel in the States and it seems they were, in fact, trained there.

The war on terrorism is not going to be an easy one. Those responsible for directly taking this action are already dead. I do not want to see Australia commit its capabilities
to any war. My greatest fear is that this will be another useless waste of human life—perhaps a repeat of the Iraqi war in which thousands of civilians were killed whilst the perpetrator remained elusive. Sanctions and daily bombing are killing thousands of civilians in Iraq even now.

If it is established to the satisfaction of America that Afghanistan is the country which harbours the prime suspect, does that mean that Australia will join America in killing as many Afghans as it takes before Osama bin Laden is handed over?

It is difficult for me to say this in a condolence motion and I wish that item (7) in the motion did not make it necessary, but I think that before we consider military action, we must take a long hard look at the situation which gave rise to this horrendous attack.

I do not want to suggest there could ever be any justification for this kind of action—there is not—but if we are to make the world safe from terrorism, we need to understand how terrorists operate, what gives rise to the action and the political context in which it has happened. We cannot be selective about history, even at times like this. The rise of fundamentalism and the Taliban in Afghanistan has its roots in world power interference. I am enormously relieved that the might of the US military was not used immediately in a counterattack. I hope this restraint continues. The destructive repercussions of a war in this region could indeed be terrible.

I urge the government to confine this motion to one of heartfelt and deep regret for those who have died and been injured. It should be a motion which everyone in this place can easily support without the suggestion that the Senate supports an Australian call to arms.

Senator CROSSIN (Northern Territory) (4.53 p.m.)—I rise on behalf of all my constituents in the Northern Territory to offer my deepest condolences to those families whose lives have been so tragically shattered with the events of the past week. I also offer my thoughts of sincere concern and support to those who wait for any news of their loved one, their work mate or their friend.

This is a tragedy of unspeakable dimensions. Millions of people around the globe will have watched these graphic events in stunned disbelief and sorrow. This is an attack on democracy and freedom and a display of terror on innocent victims which was never warranted. This display of hatred and anger strikes at the heart of those of us who value justice and democracy. There are many of us in countries around the world.

Thousands of people have fought long and hard to maintain these values and are proud of this. But this incredible act of violence has made us all stand strong beside each other in the family of democracy and has highlighted the courage of the people of America to reaffirm these principles and to commit to rebuilding their society. When a terrorist in this world decides to attack one of us, he attacks all of us—those of us who believe in democracy and freedom.

People in the Northern Territory have faced a number of natural disasters over many years on a large scale, disasters which have made people in this country watch helplessly as their lives have changed forever. Cyclone Tracy and the Katherine floods of 1998 are but two of these. These events have nurtured a sense of community and strength amongst people in the Territory. Territorians understand how hard it is to rebuild and recreate the society in which people live and the enormous challenges which this brings and, therefore, will have some understanding of what people in New York are facing. But for the people in New York, these events are an international crime. A crime of this proportion makes it difficult to understand why. People are angry and are searching for answers as to why there was such anger and hatred and disrespect for ordinary people who were simply doing their job and playing their role in society.

The Northern Territory is a very multicultural and harmonious community. Up to 64 nationalities from around the world have made their homes there, many of whom are Christians, Jews or Muslims. Of the people on Christmas Island and Cocos Island, whom I represent in the electorate of the Northern Territory, there is a large population of Muslims who have been affected not only by the
events of the last week but of the last few months. My electorate is testimony to the fact that many nationalities can live together in a spirit of community and peace. It is important that those in our community who are Muslims are not the source of people’s anger or become a target for retaliation.

Last week, we witnessed the worst single act of terrorism and evil that has occurred in our lifetime, an event that I was hoping my children and grandchild would never have to witness or try to understand. My deepest sympathy goes to all those people whose lives have been forever affected by these events; my gratitude for the courage shown by those assisting in this operation, be they firemen, medics, police or volunteers; my admiration for the people of America in regaining their strength in the face of this most dreadful event; and my support, along with all people in the Northern Territory, in joining with the rest of the world in finding those responsible for this atrocity and for bringing them to justice.

Senator GIBSON (Tasmania) (4.58 p.m.)—I rise to support the government’s motion on this matter. All of us are upset about it. Today, I come to the chamber to talk about a personal vignette of this incident. My younger son, David, who is an analyst working for Macquarie Bank in New York, woke us the other night to say, ‘Dad, I’m ringing to say I’m okay.’ Because we had not been watching the news I said, ‘Well, of course you are okay; I’m talking to you.’ He said, ‘No, listen. This is what’s happened in New York. I’m ringing you now because when you wake up in the morning, the phones will be jammed and you won’t be able to chase me. I’m ringing to let you know I’m okay.’ I thanked him. He said, ‘I was at a meeting at half past eight this morning in another building’—he works in mid-Manhattan—‘and I saw a plane going the wrong way down the river.’ I said, ‘Gee, that’s strange.’ He watched it head towards the World Trade Centre; that was the first plane.

The part that I want to put on the record in the Senate this afternoon is from a colleague of his, Rory Robertson, who sits opposite David in the same office. Rory is Macquarie’s interest analyst. I have been fortunate in the last year or so to have been on his distribution list for emails which come out a couple of times a week. They are about interest rates and the economy in the USA and their relevance to Australia. Rory was in the World Trade Centre when the first plane hit. I will read out the relevant part of his email. It is an interesting story.

This is my account of some of the terrible things that happened in New York City today, followed by some thoughts on the financial market implications.

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

At about 8.45 am, we were on the ground floor of the World Trade Centre Marriot 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 I was okay. The mobile wouldn’t work but eventually Gwen got through, and she phoned Matt 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 a 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. My head was still spinning. People in the street were watching, some crying, most stunned. One guy walking beside me said the US was now at war; I said that it would have been a terrorist group, not a nation, that had attacked. He said it didn’t matter.

My brother Alisdair called, and I said I was fine. He asked if the buildings were still standing. I said yeah, marvelling at how little the first tower had shaken, given that it was hit by an airliner. I was nearly back to midtown when someone said that the WTC had collapsed; I said no, it was hit by two planes. He said no, a tower had collapsed. I got home and watched the second tower collapse live on TV; I also saw replays of the plane that had flown above me. Scary.

I thought I should put on record details from an Australian living in New York who was actually in the tower at the time.

**Senator Murray (Western Australia)**

(5.03 p.m.)—I wish to join this motion of condolence and support. In doing so, I want to make it clear that I speak not only for me but for my wife and family, who have been very moved by these events. All of us struggle for the words to express our feelings about these matters. I can quite freely say that I remained in shock for the entire night that this first broke upon us. I was unable really to make any remark at all but just stared with absolute incredulity at the television set as I heard the unfolding horror.

I have been amazed—as one inevitably is by human beings—at the strength and fortitude of the American people. I think they have done astonishingly well given the appalling circumstances of this terrorist attack. I have also been very impressed by the Australian people. I know we fear those who will lash out blindly at those of another race or religion, but I have the general impression that Australians have conducted themselves well in a situation where at least 70, perhaps more, are missing or dead. As an Australian parliamentarian, I offer my sincere condolences to their friends and families.

There are a number of parliamentarians and many other Australians who have had the honour of serving in the armed forces of Australia and other countries. There are fewer, thank goodness, who have served in conditions of war. I am one of those, and I wish to refer to that briefly because I think it has relevance in these times when people may take exaggerated positions. I was a person who supported majority rule in southern Africa, in my country of Rhodesia at that time. However, I was a volunteer and served with the Rhodesian Air Force from 1969 to 1977 as a territorial member. I have seen war. I know the smell and look of death. I have heard the screams of wounded and injured people. War is not something to be embarked on lightly.

This action will produce—and quite rightly—a counteraction, and this thing will go on for some time until it is eventually finished. That is what we will face here. Therefore, when we consider our role as an ally of the United States and as a friend of all democracies and of all free peoples, we must
also remember that it is our responsibility to observe the rules of war and to ensure that retaliation is just and directed, not random and arbitrary. I have confidence that our own government and parliament will see to that side of things.

I know there are people who are a little afraid of clause (7) of this motion. I personally fully support clauses (1) to (8) and the words within them, because I expect the Australian government, whether it be a coalition government or a Labor government, to act in the full interests of this country and to return to their parliament when it is necessary to consider matters in the national interest, including the deployment of troops.

But I caution care in those who have not known war—care in their expression of themselves and care in their advocacy. What we need here is a considered, professional and moral response to an outrageous, evil and immoral act. Whilst I put across a note of caution, I want to make it clear that I am not a pacifist and I think that these actions have to be returned with vigour.

Senator FERGUSON (South Australia) (5.08 p.m.)—I rise to strongly support this motion before the Senate today. As many of you are well aware, I spent some 3½ months in New York just prior to Christmas. During that time, people often asked me to describe New York and what it was really like. The words that often came to my mind and my wife’s mind were ‘vibrant’, ‘busy’, ‘alive’, and ‘safe’. One of the words that was often used by us about New York was ‘safe’. Many times after dark my wife would walk down Second Avenue on her own. She said she felt safer in many streets of New York than she did in our own home city. I remember that quite vividly.

I particularly also have memories of all the Australians that I came into contact with who are working in New York. Amongst those, of course, was Senator Gibson’s son David—who was there while we were there—and a considerable number of other Australians who are working and living in New York, some of whom regarded it as home and others of whom regarded themselves as Australians in New York. My wife was particularly involved in Australian Women in New York, a group that meets on a regular basis. I was very saddened to read of at least one member of that group who was killed in the twin towers collapse. I could not help but feel very strongly when I saw the graphic reporting of what was happening in New York, having walked down those streets so many times.

As far as the motion is concerned, I think it should be supported in its entirety, exactly as it is. I cannot believe that anybody could find objection to the very carefully worded seventh clause of this motion, which says that the Senate:

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.

There is no mention in this motion of all-out indiscriminate bombing. There is no mention of all-out indiscriminate attacks against people who certainly were not involved with these attacks. I have read Senator Brown’s amendments and have heard that some of the Democrats want to withdraw the seventh clause of this motion. We are often accused in government of making some political advantage out of events that happen. I look at Senator Brown’s amendments, in which he ‘urges world leaders to respond to calls for revenge with calm and reason’. I cannot think of any more calm and reasoned response than that taken by President Bush and the American administration to date. Here we are, six days after the events took place and, while the American people are still grieving in the way that we would expect them to grieve, there has been no indiscriminate response. It has been a calm and reasoned response to what has happened. Senator Brown, in his amendments, urges them to respond with calm and reason. That is exactly what is happening.

Then we get to the other matters he adds. I simply do not support the things that he is saying and I am inclined to declare my enthusiastic support for the condolence motion as it is moved in clause (7). One of my favourite sayings is, ‘It’s a good job we don’t know what’s around the corner.’ It is a good job in events such as this—horrific events which shake the very foundations of our be-
liefs—that we do not know. If we did know what was around the corner, it would make life very difficult for us. But I cannot help feeling extreme sorrow for the over 5,000 people, it seems, who were destroyed in one wanton, indiscriminate, horrendous crime—because it is a crime; it is nothing short of that. If we allow terrorism to rule our lives internationally, then the world will be a much worse place than it is because of some of the other things that we think that are not so perfect in the world of today.

I believe that the American response to what has happened in New York has been one of reason and calm. I certainly hope that when action does take place against those who are responsible for the tragic attacks that took place last Tuesday, it will be done with all the might possible, to try to ensure that such events do not occur again. I heard people talk about attending to world poverty and all of the other things which cause all these things to happen. The world is always looking at world poverty, because we know that the one way that we can improve the conditions of people living in the world is to improve their education, which will enable them to somehow get out of the poverty trap. But when we come to a serious situation such as this, to try to attach all of these other things onto a condolence motion, for a little bit of short-term political expediency, de-means the people that are proposing it. This resolution before the Senate has my absolute and total support. I extend my sympathy to anybody who in any way has been affected by this tragedy, whether it is by loss of a loved one or by loss of their innocence.

Senator BARTLETT (Queensland) (5.14 p.m.)—I would like to lend my support to the expressions of horror and to the conveying of sympathy contained within this motion to both the people of the USA and the families and loved ones of those Australians killed in this dreadful attack, which should be condemned. The Democrats are already on the record, the day following the attacks, through our leader, Senator Stott Despoja, supporting expressions of condolence by the Prime Minister and calls by the US President to bring the perpetrators to justice. It is appropriate that this Senate and this parliament pass motions of condolence, of sympathy and of condemnation of these attacks. It is worth pointing out, in light of the comments just made by Senator Ferguson, that paragraph (7) in this motion does not relate to a condolence motion at all. It specifically talks about potentially committing Australian defence forces and troops. Whilst that is an appropriate topic to consider, it is appropriate to consider it separately rather than in the context of a condolence motion. That is the point that the Democrats have been making.

I would like to particularly support point (8) of the motion, as it 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. We have unfortunately seen some displays of intolerance in the Australian community and deliberate attempts by some in the media to inflame that intolerance. We have seen the quite terrible attacks on some in the Muslim community in various parts of Australia, including in my home town of Brisbane, where a bus carrying children from a Muslim school was stoned by various people as it went by. I think attacks like that should be strongly condemned and absolutely opposed.

It is worth highlighting when we are talking about the role of tyranny, oppression and terrorism in various parts of the world that what Australians and people in the United States have had to experience in such a terrible way a week ago is similar to what many people in other parts of the world have had to experience for some time. They have had to face the same tyranny, oppression, abomination and criminal acts, including from regimes such as the Taliban. In that context, it is worth emphasising that in the same way as we express support and sympathy for those who were the victims of this terrorist and tyrannical attack and look for ways to ensure that those who commit such acts are brought to justice and that the victims of those acts are supported, we should also lend our support to others who are fleeing such persecution, including those who arrive on our shores fleeing such tyranny and persecution. I think we should look to take the same approach to others who are suffering and who
have suffered for many years in the face of similar persecution, possibly in some cases from the same people or groups of people who have committed this latest abomination.

The Democrats also emphasise that any response—as I think many have said in this debate, a response that should be measured, reasoned and balanced—should include and incorporate the role of the United Nations. In noting the role of ANZUS and the ANZUS Treaty in this motion, it should be highlighted that the UN is a central part of that ANZUS Treaty. It should not be assumed that ANZUS is simply a treaty that involves Australia and the US alone these days; it also requires the involvement of the United Nations. The United Nations should be centrally involved in any response in relation to this terrorist action, whether through ANZUS or through other multilateral activities.

In some ways I believe we can hope that the range of global cooperation that may occur as a consequence of this action might well serve to provide mechanisms for greater cooperation across a range of areas which should include supporting people in other parts of the world who are victims of, or who are subject to, tyranny and oppression by regimes that do not respect human rights and that do seek to wreak havoc on, and cause the death of, innocent people.

In speaking in support of those other parts of this motion, I reinforce my party’s, the Democrats’, and our leader’s expressions of support and condolence for all those who have suffered as a result of these attacks, including the people of the United States and the large number of Australians who are grieving today. I would also like to note that I knew Andrew Knox—not as well as others—from previous contacts. If we look at Andrew as just one person with enormous ability and talent who was making a contribution and who had the potential to bring so much that is positive to the world and multiply that by the potential contribution to the world of the 70 or more Australians who have now been lost and then multiply that again by the thousands who have now lost the opportunity to contribute in a positive way to the world, we can see the enormity of this crime and the enormity of the loss that all of us feel at this time.

I join in supporting the condolences of others in this place. I note the support of my entire party in that and the calls by all of the Democrats for a measured response, and for a response by the community at large, as well as by governments, that supports tolerance and inclusiveness of all in our community and that supports all those who are the victims of persecution and terror throughout the world.

Senator PAYNE (New South Wales) (5.21 p.m.)—I rise to make some brief remarks also on this condolence motion. I think that the service held in the Great Hall earlier today, which brought together almost all members and senators who were able to attend, the leaders of our nation, representatives of the international community in Canberra, this building’s community and the Canberra community, was a particularly fitting way for this parliament to acknowledge the horror that has been wrought by terrorism in the United States last week, not just on Americans but on the citizens of almost 40 other nations, including our own.

I particularly thank Tom Schieffer, the United States Ambassador to Australia, for his words. I think you could have heard a pin drop in the Great Hall, and it is not often that you can say that. His message was a particularly powerful and evocative one that will ring in many of our ears for days to come. All of our sympathies—and mine particularly—are with the families of those who were killed and those who are still missing, and to the families of those Australians involved I particularly record my heartfelt sympathies.

I have been struck, in the last week—as it is almost a week now—by how technology changes our appreciation of events. It is useful to reflect for just a moment on the impact of technology’s delivery of this horror via CNN or the BBC directly into our homes. The impact worldwide is absolutely extraordinary, in a way in which such horrors previously were not. It has an impact on people’s minds, and their conceptions of such events change as a result of that. Think of the emails that were sent by people in the World
Trade Centre who reported the attacks to friends and to families and said that they thought they would get down safely enough, but were caught in the maelstrom of the building’s collapse. Think of the mobile telephone calls made by those on hijacked planes in deciding what they were to do with the few moments left to them and of the calls made on mobile phones from some of those trapped which in fact led to some being rescued. The immediacy of the events is what has really struck me in the last few days.

I have also wondered, reading some of the media and looking at some of the tapes, what young Australians are thinking when they look past the horror, when they hear the media and the debate, they may well—particularly in the area in which I work predominantly, greater Western Sydney—look around their schools and see themselves sitting with school friends from many different cultural backgrounds, many probably Muslim, and ponder these events in the United States and what they might mean for them and their futures. We need to make sure that the diversity and the tolerance which has enabled Australia to build our strong, modern community continues. We need to note that these are not crimes of Islam; these are crimes of individual criminals. Australia needs to ensure that our community works together and stays together as we fight, with the United States, this war against terrorism.

I note the enormous contribution of the many rescuers—some of whom are part of the normal emergency services teams of the cities of New York and Washington and of Pennsylvania, and some of whom are volunteers—particularly the police and fire department officers who face danger in their everyday work, and their families know that, but rarely, thankfully, do they face anything like this, and some have paid—too many—for their job with their lives, as did those who were simply going about their daily job on the morning of 11 September. I also look at this through the eyes of an extraordinary Australian woman, who I admire, love and respect enormously, Debra Walton Collings. She is an Australian New Yorker friend, if you like, who left Australia in 1987—the day after she was married, I think—and has worked in the finance industry in the United States ever since. She is currently here because she came back to visit her father who is very unwell. Her friends, the people she worked with for years at Cantor Fitzgerald and similar companies, were in the World Trade Centre. I cannot imagine how she feels, watching it from this distance, watching her city in this state, watching something that is nothing short of barbarism.

The perpetrators, as many have said this afternoon, must be carefully and logically identified, pursued and punished. Their efforts to destroy the fabric of the community of the United States with their attacks in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania will not succeed. The world community—including the Australian community—has rallied behind the United States in this battle against terrorism. I believe that is where our strengths lies: in that cohesion that we have to protect the fundamental freedoms of this world. It will ensure that it is those freedoms that can take us forward, not the sort of barbarism that has been perpetrated that can only take us backwards.

Senator CRANE (Western Australia) (5.26 p.m.)—Until the events of last Tuesday, the thing I remembered most starkly in my life was the assassination of the then President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. We were travelling from our parents’ farm to our new block of land and our truck broke down. We happened to be on the side of the road in the middle of the night and we had a small radio. We turned it on and my brother and I heard every word of it. Last Tuesday, I was in very different circumstances. My wife, Thea, and I were at a dinner with a very good friend of yours, Madam President, the Speaker of the Singaporean parliament—and he sends his best regards—Mr Tan Soo Khoon. Present at that dinner were Mr Charles Chong and his wife, Mrs Chong, Mr Sin Boon Ann, Dr Lily Neo and her husband, Dr Ben Neo, and the assistant clerk of parliament. Also present from Australia were Mr Garry Nehl and his wife, Sue, Alan Morris, Tanya Plibersek and our parliamentary secretary, Rick Williams, and Mr A. Pala-
niappan, who is the representative supporting the Australian delegation from Singapore.

The first we heard was when Sin Boon Ann received a phone call from his family saying that America had been attacked. Immediately, we did not believe it, but then further information came in and, I guess by weight of information, we had to believe it. After some discussion, Thea and I went up to see the television. CNN was on and, as we walked in the door, a voice on the television said, ‘Here comes another plane,’ and we saw the second plane fly straight into that building. I cannot find words to describe that. I think the most horrific thing was seeing people jumping out of stories so high from the ground and knowing that they had a choice of either crashing to their death by jumping out of the window—or off the ledge—or being incinerated in an inferno. I hope I never see anybody having to make that choice again in those circumstances. It left us totally bewildered.

We then had further discussion with our hosts. Of course, everybody was wondering what to do next, wondering what was going to happen. After some discussion, we decided that the events we had just witnessed, albeit on a screen, were probably as significant as, or would become more significant than, Pearl Harbor. Our Singaporean friends, who were incredibly good hosts and kept us very busy, shared the same concerns and the same thoughts as we Australians did at that time. In some ways, we were fortunate to be in another country and to share that with one of our very good allies.

I support in its totality the motion before us today. I offer my sincere condolences to all, in particular the Australian families who have lost their loved ones or are still waiting, trying to find out whether there is any hope for those who are missing. I want to pay tribute to the firefighters, police officers and volunteers, particularly those who went in to save others and then paid the ultimate sacrifice themselves: they did not get out. I want to mention those in the planes. To board a plane or to go about doing your job and to be sacrificed by fanatics is not acceptable in a civilised world. I say to the President of the United States, George W. Bush, that I admire his humility and grace, his strength in America’s hour of need, his resolution in tracking down those responsible and his acknowledgment that virtually all people of all faiths, including Muslims, are good, law-abiding and peace loving citizens—I think that the comment he made to that effect is incredibly important in the response to these fanatics. His statement was so clear: ‘If you were part of this atrocity, if you made it your business to be involved, we’re coming to get you; further, if you are a country that is harbouring terrorists, you are on our shortlist.’ In my view, that is a very appropriate response.

The response from the free world is overwhelming and consistent: we must respond with clear decisiveness to destroy this attack on innocent people, on freedom, on liberty, on justice, on democracy. It is essential that Australia play its part in making the boarding of a plane a safe action without the risk of becoming a human bomb, and in making sure that people can go to work without fear of fanatics flying aeroplanes into buildings. The quality of our civilisation in the future depends on the quality of the free world’s response. I believe that the response of our Prime Minister in the United States last week was carried out with humility and dignity, was most appropriate and did Australia proud at this difficult time. I particularly support clause (6) of the motion and reject Senator Brown’s amendments to, and Senator Stott Despoja’s comments on, this part of the motion.

Finally, I refer to the address made by the American Ambassador, Mr Thomas Schieffer, today at the memorial service. What an address: so strong and purposeful, a statement of faith. I could not do better than to end my contribution by repeating his last two lines: God bless Australia, God bless America.

Senator BRANDIS (Queensland) (5.33 p.m.)—I wishes, in speaking to this condolence motion, to associate myself with the remarks of other government and opposition senators and, in particular, with those of the Leader of the Government in the Senate, Senator Hill, and the Leader of the Opposition in the Sen-
ate, Senator Faulkner. I unhesitatingly sup-
port all eight paragraphs of the motion.

When events so shocking and awesome as 
those of 11 September 2001 erupt in our 
lives, mere words are such poor things to 
convey the depth and measure of our feel-
ings. Our anger at the evil, our disbelief at 
the sheer scale of the event, our pity for the 
victims and sorrow for their families, our 
admiration for the heroism of the rescuers, 
our determination to see these great wrongs 
avenged—none of those different emotions, 
that tangled skein of human response, seems 
adequate to the occasion.

For Australians, there are two particular 
respects in which the events of last Tuesday 
fill us with an especial grief and horror. The 
first is that so many of our own people have 
been killed. No peacetime event wrought by 
the hands of man has claimed so many Aus-
tralian lives. So the grief and sorrow we feel 
today is not just for the people of America; 
we, no less than they, are the victims. But 
because of the place in which these horrible 
events happened, and because most of the 
thousands of victims were American citi-
zens, we must feel today a special grief for 
the American people—that great and heroic 
nation which has stood shoulder to shoulder 
with Australia, in peace and war, throughout 
the hundred years of our own nationhood, 
and whose democratic institutions in fact 
provided many of the models for our nation-
hood.

Let me pay my own tribute to the Ameri-
can people. No doubt like many in this place, 
I am fortunate to be able to count several 
Americans among my close friends. Those 
friendships—most of them made at a foreign 
university 20 years ago—brought home to 
me in a very personal way what my reading 
of American history had already taught me: 
that Americans are a people of the most ex-
ceptional nobility, idealism and generosity. 
Throughout the 20th century, the world— 
and, in particular, Australia—has stood in 
America’s debt. It was America which came 
to the defence of Australia during the darkest 
hours of the Second World War, most nota-
bly during the Battle of the Coral Sea. It was 
America which rebuilt a devastated Europe 
after the Second World War in one of the 
greatest and noblest acts of the 20th century: 
the Marshall Plan. And it was America 
which led the free world through the long 
twilight struggle of the Cold War, making 
good on President Kennedy’s pledge to de-
fend freedom in its hour of maximum dan-
ger. Today more people live in liberal de-
mocracies than ever before in history; no 
nation made so significant a contribution to 
that outcome as the United States.

But the events of last Tuesday were not 
just an attack upon America, for the people 
who died in New York, Washington and 
Pennsylvania were not just Americans. Nor 
were those events just an attack upon the 
West, for many of those who were murdered 
were not Westerners; they were Japanese, 
Pakistanis, Malaysians, Sri Lankans and 
people from many other lands, from all cor-
ners of the globe. This was quite simply an 
attack upon humanity itself, conceived by 
evil minds and wrought by evil means. If 
ever there was an occasion upon which the 
difference between good and evil was so 
 starkly and so unambiguously demonstrated, 
this must have been it: the calculated murder 
of thousands of innocent men and women 
and the deliberate orphaning of thousands of 
innocent children. There can be no grey area 
in our reaction to these events. There is no 
moral ambiguity whatever about them. There 
is simply nothing that can be said in mitiga-
tion of them.

At this most difficult of times the worst 
mistake we could possibly make—and it is a 
mistake which some foolish commentators 
have already committed—would be to regard 
the events of 11 September as a symptom or 
a herald of a clash of cultures. The events 
were nothing of the sort. Those who perpe-
trated these gross crimes represented no 
culture or nation or religion. In particular, 
they did not represent Islam. As the Ameri-
can Ambassador, the Hon. Tom Schieffer, 
observered at the moving memorial service 
which we attended earlier today, just as 
Adolf Hitler, although the product of a 
Christian nation, was no Christian, so those 
who perpetrated the mass murder of innocent 
people, whatever their national origins, were 
not Moslems, for people of the Moslem 
faith—just like those of the Christian faith—
are adherents to a religion whose fundamental precepts are brotherhood and love.

Last night I had the honour of representing the Prime Minister at the opening in Brisbane of the Darul Uloom Islamic Academy, an institution built by many of the fine Australians who comprise the Islamic community in Queensland. During that ceremony every one of the imams and other Moslem community leaders who spoke expressed the same heartfelt grief which we all feel, a grief which both transcends cultures and unites them. In that transcendence lies the way forward: the recognition, born of shocking suffering, of the common values of all peoples and of all the great religious faiths which define our very humanity—the values of love and decency and justice which have shaped the response of every civilised nation to the gross and appalling suffering which has been inflicted upon so many innocents. That recognition can unite mankind in its determination that the events of last Tuesday, which forever changed the world, will not be permitted to forever change it for the worse.

Senator COONAN (New South Wales) (5.41 p.m.)—The cowardly attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon and the hijacking of the aircraft that crashed in Pennsylvania were acts of pure evil. The viciousness and enormity of these terrorist attacks have barely sunk in. Our hearts go out to the loved ones of the over 5,000 victims and to the friends and relatives of the Australian victims. We pay tribute to the rescuers and the heroic firemen who lost their lives. We pay tribute to the American people in perhaps their darkest hour. Now is the time for sorrow and mourning. Now is the time for grief and cries for justice.

America has been the bastion of the democratic freedoms that we take for granted. The attack on America is an attack on our own fundamental and shared values. In combating terrorism the aim will be justice, but the means will pose new challenges. Terrorists are not a conventional enemy. They are calculated in their actions and committed to destruction. As President George Bush has said, ‘Smoking them out will need both resolve and patience.’ We all acknowledge the practical difficulties of knowing who the enemy is and how to combat its methods. It is not intended, nor is it justifiable, to equate all people of Muslim faith with the fanatical terrorists who wreak havoc clothed in the ideology of Islam. To suggest that such acts have the moral authority of one of the great faiths of the world is a travesty.

Yesterday I was invited to participate in a broadcast on an Arabic radio station. I was told of the anxiety of many law-abiding Muslims in Sydney who are just as horrified as the rest of us by the carnage and havoc that the world has just witnessed. Make no mistake: those who destroy in the name of Islam and who propagate a culture of hate do not speak or act for most Muslims, certainly not the ones I have the privilege of knowing. We must guard against prejudice. We must guard against victimisation of Muslim people simply because of their religious faith. We must also be resolute in our conviction that terrorism must be eradicated. That is what is expected of us as leaders: that we will seek to ensure that the perpetrators are brought to justice and that such an event will never happen again.

Of course, there can be no guarantees, but there must be unyielding efforts to achieve both of these objectives. How might this be done? Australia has committed to support, within its capabilities, United States led action to bring those responsible to justice. This is in hand. It will be nothing short of a campaign, and Australia will honour its ANZUS obligations, as it must and should. Terrorism is a global threat. To stamp it out requires international support. It will also require an understanding of the conditions that permit a culture of hate to take root and flourish. It is a supreme irony, I think, that those who hate America seek the fruits of economic prosperity that can be fostered only by a free and enterprising people.

There are many challenges ahead in responding to terrorist attacks, not the least of which is doing so within the confines of international law and custom. The President of the United States, George W. Bush, has cast the net wide. He makes no distinction between those who carry out terrorist attacks and those who enable, support or harbour
them. Seeking out harbouring states may pose some difficulties within the United Nations charter, international law and the norms of conduct. Historically, the United Nations Security Council has not always sanctioned armed reprisal against harbouring states as an act of self-defence, but dealing with this shadowy enemy, reputed to have cells in 34 different countries, may and probably will require novel approaches to the territorial integrity of other states. The United States is quite rightly consulting widely and seeking international cooperation to stamp out terrorism. The hopes and aspirations of the free world mandate the justness of this cause. The course to victory may be long, but decency, tolerance, civilisation and freedom will triumph. There will be no turning back. I commend the motion in its entirety.

Senator CALVERT (Tasmania) (5.47 p.m.)—I too join in this motion of condolence this afternoon. As a Tasmanian and, therefore, an Australian, I know that I speak on behalf of all Tasmanians in conveying my condolences to the families and other loved ones of victims, particularly the families of those Australians who were killed or are missing as a result of these chilling and cowardly terrorist attacks. Had it just been 70 Australians missing or killed by terrorists, it would have been something that Australia would probably be thinking about and talking about for years to come, but when you think that in totality 5,000 people are missing or killed it puts in perspective what a horrific, shocking tragedy this has been. I also join the Senate in expressing my own family’s condolences to all those nations whose citizens were killed or are missing and all those people whose friends and relations were killed or are missing as a result of this tragedy.

Many organisations and individuals have spoken about the enormity of the events of last week, but even now we are still stunned and finding it hard to believe. As an American emergency management worker said:

Words cannot describe the way it is. It is impossible.

Who of us will ever forget those chilling video clips of a Boeing 767 disappearing into the side of the building, almost like a knife going into butter or a finger going into jelly? It just seemed impossible that something like that could happen. We have been reminded many times over about the terrible loss of life and about how many different countries have been affected by this horrific act. I guess those images will last, with our generation anyway, forever. I can feel only the greatest respect for the American people. At times like this, their patriotism, their loyalty to each other, their belief in a god and their strength in the face of such a catastrophic attack on their everyday lives are things that we all take note of and things that I think were summed up very admirably by the American Ambassador today.

It does not seem all that long ago that we watched the Gulf War on CNN. Here again through CNN we see this tragedy that happened in New York brought to the whole world. Like many of the people who have spoken today, I have been to New York a couple of times. It is a vibrant, busy city. It is probably one of the great cities of the world. Seeing this happen made me recall looking back from the Staten Island ferry towards New York and seeing the twin towers and how they dominated the skyline of Manhattan Island. It almost beggars belief to think that buildings like that could be destroyed.

I would like to pass on to the Senate some comments from a young man who is a former Tasmanian who has lived and worked in New York City for some time and who was lucky enough to escape alive. He was asked:

Will you leave the city now, given the tragic events that have unfolded here?

He replied:

No, I will be staying put in New York City to help rebuild and reshape this city and its economy.

He added:

I will also be helping those people in this city who are scarred or with losses, and I will be helping them to return to normal life. That seems to be the attitude of all New Yorkers, whether they be native New Yorkers or people who have gone there to live and work. I know that many individual Australians are helping and will help in any way they can to rebuild and to reshape and to help Americans return to normal life. I believe
that is what Americans would do if we were put in a similar situation.

The Australian capacity to get in and give our time and resources in the event of crisis is something we can be proud of. That has been borne out many times here when we have had crises in our own backyard, as we saw, for instance, at Port Arthur. I was certainly proud to hear of the work of the Australian consulate staff in New York and the assistance they have been giving to so many people. Last week, I was here at the CPA Conference in Canberra, and I was contacted by Bruce Goodluck's family. They were concerned about the welfare of Bruce and Cynthia, who were staying at the Millennium Hotel in New York. Luckily, it was the Millennium Plaza next to the United Nations building and not the one next door to the twin towers of the World Trade Centre. Luckily, I was able to contact Lou Lieberman, who is in New York with Rosemary Crowley at the UN, and I would like to put on record a tribute to Lou for the assistance he gave to Bruce and his wife. They certainly must have been traumatised by what happened there, and I think just to hear a friendly voice helping them out would have been something they would have appreciated. I would also like to put on record the work that Lou Lieberman and Rosemary Crowley have been doing there, taking calls and helping out wherever they can.

There have been numerous other examples of Australians in the USA rallying around and lending a hand. I hope that all Australians will continue to assist in whatever way we can to overcome the loss and the scars of this tragedy. As has been said earlier, let us hope that Muslims in particular are not victimised because of the deeds of one or two members of the so-called Islamic faith who have been responsible for this massacre. As an American woman in Los Angeles was reported as saying, 'First we were shocked; then we were terrorised; now we are united.' America is united and, might I say, Australia is united with the American people in this tragedy in so many terrible ways. I fully concur with, and strongly commend, the motion to the Senate.

Senator IAN MACDONALD (Queensland—Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government) (5.53 p.m.)—I briefly want to associate myself with the motion. My colleagues in this chamber and in the other place have really said it all. There is little more that I need to add. All of us in Australia—and I suspect that this is the case right around the world—have been touched in a personal way by some event in this tragedy. In my case, I am very pleased to say that two people who I knew were in that vicinity were not injured in any way, but I am conscious that many in the parliament have had experiences not quite so fortunate—in fact, quite tragic.

I do not presume to speak for Queensland at all—I can speak for only myself—but we have a lot of contact with American tourists in the north. I know what a fine people they are and my heart goes out to many of those I have met who would be very much affected by the tragedy. I concur with all the words said about all of us living together, regardless of our religion or our creed. I know a number of Muslim people—in fact, there is a family of Muslims in Brisbane who are very strong supporters of the Liberal Party, who are very much involved, and they are a very fine group of people: people who detest, as much as we all do, the tragedy and the violence in New York.

As the territories minister, one of the great privileges that I have is to be able to travel to Cocos Island and Christmas Island quite often. Certainly on Cocos Island in particular, the majority of the population are Cocos Malays or Muslim—most of them are Muslim—and there are a number of expatriate Australians who have taken on the religion as well. They are a kind, gentle and God-fearing people who—although I have not had the opportunity of speaking to them—I know would be horrified at the tragedy, as we all are. Those people are just so kind, so generous and so supportive in everything they do that these sorts of acts would be as completely foreign to them as they are to the rest of the world. I join with my colleagues in heartfelt and sincere support for the motion and for the sentiments it expresses.
Senator PATTERSON (Victoria—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Foreign Affairs) (5.56 p.m.)—A number of people today have mentioned their having visited the United States of America or their association with America. I have very deep friendships and relationships in the United States of America. My first visit there was when I was 17 on a Girl Scout exchange, and the people I met there have become lifetime friends. I revisited as a guest of the Girl Scouts in 1965, again when I spent three months in Michigan as a Kellogg fellow, and I spent another three months in Pennsylvania. My mother lived in America for 20 years and was an American citizen. So when I watched in utter disbelief the surreal vision of those two planes crashing into the World Trade Centre on Tuesday night, heard what had happened at the Pentagon and heard that the plane had crashed in Pennsylvania with those very brave souls on board who, it seems, gave their lives to avoid more people being killed—one wonders what one would have done if one had been on that plane; I am not sure that I would have been that brave—I could not help but think of all my friends in America and how invaded they would feel, even if they were not personally affected.

I said in my maiden speech, ‘Bygone battles, like old sins, cast long shadows.’ This is an unusual form of battle. When I was talking to my father—who fought in three battlefields—on his 80th birthday on Friday, he said to me, ‘Kay, this is a modern day Trojan Horse: a Trojan Horse that came unexpectedly with unexpected people inside—inocent people and people who could commit such a dastardly deed.’ This bygone battle, like an old sin, will cast long shadows on the families of the people who have been killed: on the children, on the parents, on all those who have been affected, on the people who have been involved in the rescue, with the things that they have seen, and on the people who stood by or who escaped, including Lucy Strasser, one of my good friends who was on the 64th floor of the second building and who decided to leave when the first plane crashed. Those people will be scarred forever. There is a myriad of people who will have been associated with this and who will never be the same. The battle, like an old sin, will cast a very long shadow.

I do not think there would be one Australian who was not touched or affected by what we saw. It seemed so unfair, it seemed so unreasonable, it seemed so horrendous. My heart goes out to all those who have lost loved ones, in particular to the Australians who still wait—it is very difficult when you are so far away—but also to people from nations all around the world who have lost husbands, wives, partners and children. My condolences to the parents, grandparents and friends who grieve for them.

Indiscriminate hate, as we saw perpetrated on those innocent people going about their everyday lives, should not beget indiscriminate hate. When I was reading the press clippings today, I was overwhelmed by a comment by the brother of Leanne Whiteside, a young Australian who is missing and, I guess, presumed dead. The article in the Sunday Age states:

Grieving over a sister he fears is almost certainly dead, he has been alarmed at reports of hostility towards Muslims in Australia. ‘I want them to know that I feel no malice towards them,’ he said, ‘and if there is one statement that is mine—because this is not about me—it is for the people in Australia to not direct any animosity towards Muslims. Because that is not what we’re feeling and this ... has nothing to do with religion.’

If a young man who has lost his sister can say that, surely all Australians of goodwill ought to be able to say the same. As the United States Ambassador said in his speech today:

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.

That is a very strong message that ought to come to us. But I also hope that the leadership of the United States and of other countries joining with the United States—Australia, too—use smart tactics in addressing this issue. By ‘smart’ I mean that we ensure, as far as possible, that we direct our need to
seek justice towards those who perpetrated this crime and that innocent people who had no part in this are spared. That will take enormous courage, enormous commitment and tactics that most probably have never before had to be used. I hope that, as far as possible, we try to use smart tactics, just as we have tried to use smart sanctions in removing aid to make it more difficult for perpetrators rather than for whole populations. It is going to be a challenge for all of us, in particular for those of us who have a responsibility here in parliament in a leadership role.

As I watched, as we all did, hours and hours of CNN and saw the American flag fluttering over the rubble and devastation that was the World Trade Centre, I could not help but think of the American national anthem, which says:

And the Rockets Red Glare, the bombs bursting in the air—
I guess it was not the ‘rockets red glare’ or ‘bombs bursting in the air’ but a modern Trojan Horse—
Gave proof through the night, That our Flag was still there.
Oh say does that Star Spangled Banner yet wave,
Over the land of the free, and the home of the brave?

Senator EGGLESTON (Western Australia) (6.04 p.m.)—I rise to express my sympathy with the people of New York and with the American people for the loss of life and devastation that followed last week’s terrorist attacks. I have relatives living in New York City, so I have some direct knowledge of the impact this attack has had on the people of that great city. The New York incident has implications for us all. After New York, nowhere in the world can be regarded as safe from terrorist attack. New York is acknowledged as the capital of the Western world, and if New York can be attacked in this way so can Perth, Sydney, Hobart or Canberra.

Henry Kissinger has recently written a book entitled Does America Need a Foreign Policy? in which he observes that traditional borders between nation states have less significance in the contemporary world and that the world is now moving towards a more internationalist approach to solving problems. The worldwide reaction to the New York incident is an example of how much of a global village the world has become when people throughout the world could watch the events of last Tuesday in New York live on CNN, regardless of where they were.

It is sad to reflect that so many of the most vicious conflicts both historically and in the world of today have involved religious differences. For example, the Catholic-Protestant conflict since the late 1960s in Ireland has a 400-year history of religious antagonism behind it. The so-called ethnic cleansing the world has observed with horror in Bosnia and Kosovo in the former Yugoslavia is a historic clash between believers in Christianity and Islam. The longstanding Arab-Israeli conflict over the territory of Palestine is an old conflict where, again, religion is an important component.

It is sad when observing these conflicts to think that essentially the function of most religions in today’s world is to provide rules for people to live by. Most religions require fairness and tolerance in dealing with others, and it is truly sad that these worthy principles are all too often observed in their abeyance and that religion becomes a factor in brutal conflicts and mindless acts of terrorism.

Of course, political factors, separately or concurrently, also frequently underlie terrorism and are often a manifestation of the frustrations that one group or another may feel. However, regardless of the factors which led to the acts of terrorism, when brutal attacks on the innocent occur, as happened last week in New York, such acts of terrorism can never be condoned as a means of resolving disputes. So it is right and proper that those responsible should be hunted down and punished.

In keeping with Henry Kissinger’s observations about the new internationalism in world affairs, it is appropriate that a broad coalition of nations around the world which believe in the rule of law and the sanctity of human life should be joining together to root out and punish those responsible for the acts of terrorism which occurred last week in New York. Nations which believe in the rule
of law must join together to protect the innocent, the ordinary people of the world, from those who have no hesitation in using indiscriminate violence to achieve their ends. I commend this motion to the Senate and support its endeavours.

Senator TAMBLING (Northern Territory—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Health and Aged Care) (6.09 p.m.)—Last Tuesday and Wednesday’s tragedy in the United States, I think, was the first time since the death of President Kennedy that I had an immediate and emotional reaction that I cannot really describe other than as something of a very uncomfortable deep pit in the stomach. My immediate thought was for a young Darwin girl who I knew was working in that environment. Until I was able to establish that she was safe I felt really caught up in the whole issue.

I am pleased to support the motion before the Senate this evening. When I look at the key words, the key phrases and the tenets of each part of this motion, where we talk about the assault, the attack, the horror and where we look at the emotions that are necessary to look at now—the sympathy, the condolence, the loss, the courage, the commitment and the tolerance—it gives me a great deal of strength to know that we have been able to come together this afternoon to address these important issues that we shared with the American Ambassador at lunchtime.

There is a very special relationship between the United States and Australia—as a Northern Territorian, I am well aware of it, and I know so many of my constituents are—that goes back into the realms of history and the Second World War. Very recently, only a week or so ago, very major joint military exercises were held in Northern Australia, where I spent time on the US naval ships talking to the marines and knowing of that combined operation.

In the Northern Territory we have the important facility at Pine Gap, which must be being taxed at this important time because of the very important security issue. As a Territorian, Pine Gap makes me feel immediate sympathy for the many American families living in Alice Springs and the great impact in the community that binds the Northern Territory and the United States and how particularly strong that is.

For me, the issues are regional security and also social. Earlier today I looked very keenly at the emotions on the faces of the young people in the gallery who were visiting us whilst this debate was taking place. Last Tuesday’s tragedy is even more important because of the impact on the millions and millions of children not only in Australia but throughout the world who must be feeling this in an important way. There is, we need to recognise, an important need for psychological care and very close counseling. The events of last week will alter so dramatically the education of young people throughout the world.

Another social issue that impacted on me was the change to the risks of travel. We all know that when we travel we take certain risks, but now we will always think when we get on an aeroplane. Yesterday, when travelling down from Darwin, I looked at other people seriously and questioningly. We need to know how this is going to impact not just on the tourist industry but on each of us and our own internal views and security. There will be dramatic economic consequences of this issue around the world for years to come. We saw the devastation of the assets, the buildings. This will have profound economic consequences right around the world for many years and will steep into the area of defence planning.

An area closer to home is the immediacy of the link in the policy areas relating to illegal immigration. Our community and our electorates are taxed by the very hard decisions that the government has to make in this regard, particularly when it involves countries like Afghanistan and Pakistan where there is a natural focus. The comments that other senators have made today about the need for very special tolerance and understanding are so important. Again, I highlight the Northern Territory as a multicultural place where many races and religions live in harmony. The events of last week will now tax us so seriously that it will affect each and every area of policy making.

Finally, my comments today have regard to the issues relating to religious focus and
fanaticism, because we can only describe the horror of last week as being that of fanatics seeking to impose their will and their inadequate and totally wrong consequences on so many others. There is a need for a religious focus. There is a challenge for the future for peace and tolerance. I know that I speak for many Territorians who share the concerns of other Australians and who particularly would have us convey those important sentiments to the United States.

Senator BOLKUS (South Australia) (6.15 p.m.)—I also will not forget where I was when JFK died, when John Lennon died and when I saw the bombing of the United States of America. It was eerie to see it happen. It was immediate. It was not delayed like the previous two incidents; it was not relayed. We saw monument after monument fall over. It was frightening. When was it going to end? Was it ever going to end? Was it going to go on endlessly? In that fear, I was glad that I was away in bed in Adelaide, in an out-of-the-way place. I have got to say that we were speechless. It was with some sense of disbelief that I took a phone call from one of my state colleagues, Pat Conlon, who told me that the World Trade Centre had been attacked. My response, as I was trying to put a baby to sleep, was, ‘Mate, if it’s not on the Channel 10 news, it’s not happening.’ It was delayed in a sense, but very soon it came on live; it was real.

I suppose I was hoping that it would be a bit like H.G. Wells’s *The War of the Worlds*—that we would wake up the next morning and find out that it was not real. It was not just an attack on buildings and an attack on innocent victims; it was an attack on civilised society, on basic democratic values and on structures. As such, it was an attack on all of us and what we stand for. These acts go to and challenge the heart of organised community. A lot of people on the left have always held a view about the USA which has not been flattering, but I think it is an outdated view—unfair, immature and based on stereotypes through mass media. It is a country built on migration and its diversity. Its power comes from both its diversity and its population. The USA is the real victim but also the symbolic victim because it stands for the sorts of values that we want to defend in this particular case.

The enormity of the event was made even more personal to me because of my contact with a person who has been mentioned in both houses of parliament today: Andrew Knox. I thought I had convinced Andrew to stand for Makin the last time I saw him, but he chose to have greater experience in the world. Unfortunately we have not heard from him since the event. I obviously hope that we do. He is a great young person and a great young Labor person who, if he is not found, will be sorely missed. I am also touched by the fact that this involves New York. Robert Hill and I spent three months there in 1986. It is a state enormously energetic in its diversity and a state where communities coexist extremely well. I think it is the true global village. It is a greater offence that that global village was chosen for an act of global diversity and terrorism.

The response will not be easy—this motion before us today talks of response—but it has to happen. There has to be a response, because I do not think the world community can allow these acts to go unchallenged. The West cannot allow them to go unchallenged, but this is also—let us have no misunderstanding about this—an attack on Islam: the established order of Islam and the faith of Islam. This is foreign to the teachings of Islam. I am sure that Islamic countries, peace loving as they are around world, would find this a major offence and a threat to them as well.

Hard task No. 1 is to find the perpetrators. Bin Laden has boasted over the years that the USSR was destroyed in Afghanistan. He was teasing and tempting the United States of America to get into Afghanistan as well. Justice has to have its day, but it will be difficult unless that day happens very quickly. Placing ground forces in Afghanistan raises all sorts of problems for not just the USA but the whole world community. It is something that I am sure President Bush is aware of and something that we in this place need to keep in mind. If they do identify the perpetrators as being people in Afghanistan and if this battle is waged on the ground in Afghani-
The notion that ‘justice must have its day’ is also a challenge for Western communities because I think the expectation in those communities is probably blowing out of proportion at the moment. The more we see the enormity of the effects of this terror, the more people are aggrieved—and rightly so. That sense of resentment has built an enormous expectation of revenge and that is something that leaders around the world need to be able to contain. Justice must have its day, but this cannot be allowed to get out of control.

The other thing that I find quite difficult is what this is doing to our own community. We in this place have a responsibility to govern this community in a very cohesive way. As a former immigration minister, I still maintain friendships amongst all communities and do so with Jewish and Muslim communities in this country. The Muslim community—whose main figures I know across the country—is as offended, aggrieved, hurt and upset as the rest of us in respect of this. When these extremists took this action they did not speak for decent law-abiding Muslims; they did not speak for Islam. As I say, these actions are foreign to the teachings of Islam.

In recent days we have seen some degree of racial tension in parts of our community. We should remember—and I say this to Australians generally—that in over 50 years of large migration of people to this country we have not had acts of terrorism at home by those communities coming from the Middle East. We have been quite selective; we have been discerning. We have had the mechanisms in place to ensure that terrorists have been rejected. I think this country has been all the better for the fact that we have had those systems in place. These communities have not been responsible for acts of terrorism in this country. It is not within their character, culture and religion to perpetrate such acts. I support this motion. As I say, this is a challenge to communities around world. There will be an overwhelming world reaction to it but, as I say, it needs to be handled in such a way that it does not get out of control.

Senator HILL (South Australia—Leader of the Government in the Senate) (6.21 p.m.)—In concluding the debate, I want to thank all senators who participated and recognise that there are other senators who wished to participate but within the time allowed have been unable to do so. I know my colleagues Senator Alston and Senator Vanstone, who are at a cabinet meeting, wanted to but have been unable to do so.

There would appear to be unanimous support within the Senate for paragraphs (1) to (5) and (8) of this motion, and I appreciate that. It is important for the Senate unanimously to express its horror at these terrorist attacks; to convey to the people of the United States our deepest sympathy and sense of shared loss; to extend our condolences to the families and loved ones who are missing; to declare that such attacks represent an assault not only on the United States but on the values that we share—the values of free societies everywhere; to praise the courageous efforts of those engaged in the dangerous rescue operation; and to encourage all Australians in the wake of these appalling events to display the qualities of tolerance and inclusion which have been assaulted by the terrorists in their awful actions. I am pleased about that and that the record will show that senators from all sides of the chamber are prepared to support those sentiments.

I do feel that I have to say a few words in relation to paragraphs (6) and (7), about which there does not seem to be unanimity in the chamber and about which there has been one amendment already moved. If I might commence with paragraph (7) first. This paragraph states that the Senate:

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;

It is the position of the government that those who perpetrated such actions must be brought to justice, and that includes those who have facilitated and are supporting such terrorists. This is not a call for vengeance or retribution, but there must be a firm response to such horrific crimes.
Those of us who share the values of freedom and democracy must be prepared to shoulder that responsibility. The Prime Minister has said that we stand shoulder to shoulder with the United States in accepting that responsibility, and I am proud that we are prepared to do so. Apart from the need to protect the values of freedom and democracy, we owe it to those who have lost their lives, particularly the Australians. This is not a matter of giving the United States a blank cheque, but we will do our bit, if asked, to help bring the perpetrators of these horrendous crimes to justice and in an effort to contribute to a safer world. I hope that all senators might be prepared to endorse that sentiment when this motion is taken to the vote in a few minutes. Paragraph (6) states that the Senate:

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;

In the view of the government, this is a new form of waging war, but we accept it, nevertheless, to be an act of war. It was not just an assault on individuals; it was clearly intended as an assault, as an attack, on the United States. That is clearly why it was the institutions of the United States that were targeted, and it was a particularly vile way in which to wage war, because the institutions were attacked through the means of slaughtering thousands of innocent victims. In such circumstances, it was the Australian cabinet’s view that the terrorist actions constituted an attack on the United States and thus that the ANZUS Treaty should be invoked. A treaty is not a one-way street. There are within it benefits for Australia, but for that we accept responsibilities as well. We believe that Australia should be prepared to meet its responsibilities in these circumstances.

I do, therefore, urge those senators who are hesitating in supporting paragraphs (6) and (7) of this motion to think again. I urge them to join with us on this occasion and to support the motion that we put before the chamber. There may be a call for Australians in uniform in the future to risk their lives to protect Australia’s interests arising out of this terrorist attack. In our view, it is important that they understand that they are getting the support from this chamber that we believe they deserve.

The PRESIDENT—The question is that the amendment to the motion moved by Senator Brown be agreed to.

Question resolved in the negative.

Senator Brown—Divide.

The PRESIDENT—I did not hear two voices call in the first instance in support of the amendment. I recall Senator Bourne asking that clause (7) be put separately. Are you wishing that that should persist? Did you ask for clause (6) to be put separately? My understanding was that you did not.

Senator Bourne—Madam President, at the time I did not ask for (6); I only asked for (7).

The PRESIDENT—I shall put the motion as printed without clause (7); that is, clauses (1) to (6) inclusive and clause (8). The question is that this resolution be agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The PRESIDENT—I shall put the motion that clause (7) be agreed to as printed.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The PRESIDENT—I ask senators to stand in silence in memory of those killed as a result of the terrorist attack on United States of America

Honourable senators having stood in their places—

ADJOURNMENT

Senator HILL (South Australia—Minister for the Environment and Heritage) (6.29 p.m.)—As a mark of respect to the memory of those killed as a result of the terrorist attacks on United States of America, I move:

That the Senate do now adjourn.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Senate adjourned at 6.30 p.m.
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The following answers to questions were circulated:

Attorney-General's Department: Salaries
(Question No. 2616)

Senator Faulkner asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 25 July 2000:

(1) What was the Department’s total outlay on salaries and salary-related costs in the financial years (a) 1996-97; (b) 1997-98; (c) 1998-99 and (d) 1999-00.

(2) As a dollar amount and as a percentage of the Department’s total outlay on salaries, what was the cost of contracts for outsourced services and functions in the financial years (a) 1996-97; (b) 1997-98; (c) 1998-99 and (d) 1999-00.

Senator Ellison—The Attorney-General has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Outlay on salaries and salary-related costs</td>
<td>$182,125,787</td>
<td>$175,005,000</td>
<td>$113,332,000</td>
<td>$107,355,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Contracts for outsourced services and functions</td>
<td>$322,000</td>
<td>$424,042</td>
<td>$515,575</td>
<td>$439,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a percentage of total salaries</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The reduction in outlays on salaries and salary-related costs compared with 1997-98 is a result of the establishment of the Australian Government Solicitor as a separate FMA agency from 1 September 1998.

The Department has outsourced the following activities:
- Property management services;
- the preparation of FBT returns;
- after-hours security services; and
- switchboard services.

It should be noted that the Department was part of Cluster 10 with respect to its IT activities. Following the Humphry Report in December 2000, the Department has developed its own outsourcing strategy which it will implement over the next 12 months.

The Department has recently undertaken a tender process for the provision of a number of corporate services. As a result of the tender process, the Department decided to retain the provision of these services internally.

The Department does use consultants and contractors from time to time to assist in various corporate activities such as the preparation of financial statements and the provision of staff training and development programs.

Roads: Murrumbateman Bypass
(Question No. 3598)

Senator O’Brien asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 6 June 2001:

With reference to the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee’s hearing of 31 May 2001, during which the First Assistant Secretary, Mr Bill Ellis, advised the committee that the involvement of the Department in the Murrumbateman bypass assessment was documented on departmental files:

(1) How many files held by the department since 1996 contain the above material.

(2) In each case: (a) when was the file opened; (b) when was the file closed; and (c) what was the title of the file.

Senator Ian Macdonald—The Minister for Transport and Regional Services has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:
Senator O’Brien asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 6 June 2001:

(1) Did the Darwin office of the Civil Aviation Safety Authority issue an instrument to an operator to allow that operator to comply with the requirements of Civil Aviation Order (CAO) 82.1 paragraph 2.5 by having a single operations manual available in the company’s reference library; if so, what was the legal basis for the issuing of the instrument.

(2) Does CAO 82.1 require that copies of the manual must be provided to all operating crew members.

(3) Can the Minister confirm that the only way to override the requirements of CAO 82.1 paragraph 2.5 would be by way of a disallowable instrument.

(4) Since January 1999 on how many occasions have audits undertaken by the Darwin office checked for compliance with CAO 82.1 paragraph 2.5.

(5) (a) On how many occasions have audits identified breaches of CAO 82.1 paragraph 2.5; and (b) on each occasion, what action was taken as a result of the breach.

Senator Ian Macdonald—The Minister for Transport and Regional Services has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

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

(1) The Darwin Office varied the requirements of CAO 82.1 paragraph 2.5 in relation to a particular operator.

That paragraph requires the holder of a Charter or Aerial Work Air Operator’s Certificate (AOC) to provide copies of the AOC holder’s Operations Manual to all operating crew members. In this case, the variation enabled the operator to meet CASA requirements in relation to the provision of the Operations Manual by making these manuals openly available to the crew members at each of the operator’s operating bases, rather than individually issue a manual to each crew member in the employ of the operator.

The variation was issued under subsection 6 of Civil Aviation Order (CAO) 82.0, which permits CASA to vary the conditions or obligations placed on an AOC under the Orders, following an application for such a variation by the holder of an AOC.

(2) Paragraph 2.5 of CAO 82.1 requires the holder of an AOC authorising charter or aerial work operations to provide copies of the holder’s operations manual to all operating crew members employed by operator.

In the past, CASA has accepted arrangements for dissemination of operational information by operators which did not involve the provision of copies of the operations manual to each and every member of the operator’s operating crews.
These arrangements were authorised by an appropriate variation of the AOC condition imposed by paragraph 2.5 of CAO 82.1, in accordance with the requirements of subsection 6 of CAO 82.0. The variations were issued on the basis that the arrangements operated to give operating crews ready access to operations manuals at times and in locations where they could be reasonably expected to need such access, and in doing so met the underlying safety purpose of paragraph 2.5. However, CASA’s current policy in relation to dissemination of operational material does not generally permit the relaxing of the requirements of paragraph 2.5 of CAO 82.1; this policy has been promulgated through Compliance Management Instruction 01/33 of May 2001, a copy of which is attached.

(3) The power to vary the requirements of paragraph 2.5 of CAO 82.1 is contained in subsection 6 of CAO 82.0. An instrument of variation issued by CASA under that section is not a disallowable instrument. Such an instrument is not a prescribed direction or exemption for the purposes of regulation 5A of the Civil Aviation Regulations 1988, because it is issued under the authority of a provision of an Order, not under a provision of the regulations.

(4) Since January 1999, there have been ten (10) audits by the Darwin Office as to compliance with the requirements of CAO 82.1, paragraph 2.5 by AOC holders within that Office’s area of responsibility.

(5) (a) It is not appropriate to provide the requested level of operational detail regarding operators. Disclosure of information on the outcomes of an audit process could prejudice an operator’s commercial interests and could also prejudice CASA’s ability to obtain information from other operators during the course of normal investigations where compulsory extraction powers are not used.

(b) All matters raised with operators within the oversight of the Darwin Area Office, involving compliance with CAO 82.1 requirements for operations manual distribution, have been addressed.

Part IVA Panel: Hearings
(Question No. 3609)

Senator Murray asked the Assistant Treasurer, upon notice, on 12 June 2001:

(1) Can the dates of the Part IVA Panel hearings and the case decision numbers for the following cooperative investment projects be provided:

Prodigy Poll Hereford; Bopple Macadamia; Barkworth Olives; TENTAS; Satcom; Peter Pan; Servcom; Central Highlands; Budplan; Peel Valley Mushrooms; Austvin; Banalasta; Main Camp; Tumut River Orchard; Treetop Plums; ANF Lemon Myrtle; Northern Rivers Tea Tree; Golden Vintage; Chalice Bridge; No Regrets; Liar Liar; Macquarie Equity Linked Bonds; and any employee share plans.

(2) Were minutes of these Part IVA Panel hearings kept by the Australian Taxation Office.

Senator Kemp—The answer to the honourable senator’s question is as follows:

(1) Matters considered by the Part IVA Panel are not referred to by case decision numbers. As to dates that individual cases were considered by the Panel, I do not propose to table information about the affairs of particular taxpayers.

Once a particular arrangement has been considered by the Part IVA Panel in the context of one scheme, arrangements employing the same techniques are not normally be reconsidered by the Panel in relation to a later scheme. However, later arrangements will be reviewed by officers of the Tax Counsel Network.

(2) The Australian Taxation Office keeps a report of each meeting and the recommendations made by the Panel.

Aviation: Aircraft Carrying Depleted Uranium
(Question No. 3620)

Senator Greig asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 15 June 2001:

(1) Which civil aircraft operating in Australia carry depleted uranium for ballast or other purposes.
(2) How much depleted uranium is carried by an individual aircraft of each type using depleted uranium.

(3) What rules apply to the use of depleted uranium in civil aircraft.

(4) What arrangements exist to deal with possible health hazards from depleted uranium, for example, by dispersion of depleted uranium after a wash.

Senator Ian Macdonald—The Minister for Transport and Regional Services has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

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

(1) and (2) The Civil Aviation Safety Authority has no regulations covering the use of depleted uranium in Australian civil registered aircraft. CASA is not aware of which aircraft incorporate depleted uranium in their design, or how much is carried by individual aircraft.

(3) As indicated above, CASA does not regulate against the use of depleted uranium in Australian civil registered aircraft. The use of depleted uranium, for example in flying control system balance weights, is also not a matter that is considered as part of the certification process or for permitting aircraft to operate in Australia.

(4) CASA has issued an Airworthiness Advisory Bulletin AWB 00-005 - Depleted Uranium in Aircraft, the purpose of which is to remind all individuals working on aircraft manufactured utilising depleted uranium, of the need to follow the aircraft manufacturers’ and the Occupational Health and Safety recommendations when working with the material. The Bulletin also states that disposal of the depleted uranium (DU) balance weights or any other components containing DU or other radioactive material, may only be undertaken by a state licensed toxic waste recipient. This Bulletin is available on CASA’s website at www.casa.gov.au/prod/avreg/aircraft/awb/00/0005.htm.

Irradiation Plant: Narangba

(Question No. 3629)

Senator Brown asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 18 June 2001:

With reference to the proposed irradiation facility at Narangba in Queensland:

(1) What independent studies of the proposal have been made by the Commonwealth and what were the findings.

(2) Will the facility be fully insured, in particular, against radioactive contamination in the local environment or of the workers; if not, why not.

(3) Have the proponents’ existing facilities been free of problems involving radiation or the threat of radiation.
   (a) Have local real estate values fallen due to the plant being rezoned; and
   (b) is such an impact on real estate a consideration for the Minister.

(5) Will food be stored in the toxic and hazardous waste zone.

(6) What emergency plans has the Commonwealth agreed to for the transport, use and storage of nuclear materials.

(7) Has the Commonwealth consulted with the Moreton Bay fishing industry about this plant in its catchment; if so, what was the outcome.

Senator Hill—The answer to the honourable senator’s question is as follows:

(1) My Department is conducting an environmental impact assessment of the proposal under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (the EPBC Act). As part of the process the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation and the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency have been consulted.

(2) Yes. Steritech has advised that the Brisbane plant will be fully insured, as are the two existing plants.
(3) Yes. There has not been any accident, event or problem that has posed a radiation or contamination threat to Steritech employees, member of the public or the environment at any time during the life of the existing plants.

(4) (a) Not to my knowledge.

(b) The Act sets out the factors that must be taken into account in making an approval decision - see s.136-s.140a.

(5) No. Food will not be stored at the plant. It is unclear as to which ‘hazardous and toxic waste zone’ the question refers. However, the Narangba Industrial Estate is a designated ‘Special Development Zone’ that provides for hazardous, noxious or offensive industries.

(6) No emergency plans have been agreed, as the proposal has not received Commonwealth or State approval. Should the proposal be approved, any such plans would be similar to those in place for the existing plants in Victoria and New South Wales, as approved by the relevant regulatory authorities in those States. Emergency plans for the Narangba plant would be developed in cooperation with Queensland Radiation Health and the relevant Queensland emergency services.

(7) Representatives of the Moreton Bay fishing industry have not been consulted, as there is no credible way that the Steritech proposal could have any significant environmental impact on Moreton Bay.

Australian Competition and Consumer Commission: Commercial and General Publications Pty Ltd
(Question No. 3635)

Senator Brown asked the Minister representing the Treasurer, upon notice, on 19 June 2001:

With reference to the case of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) and Mr Tony Hassett, in Tasmania:

(1) Is it a fact that the Tasmanian Office of Consumer Affairs and Fair Trading informed the ACCC that there had not been any complaints about Mr Hassett or his business; if so: (a) why did the ACCC investigation proceed; and (b) what is the ACCC’s understanding of why no complaints had reached the Tasmanian Consumer Affairs division.

(2) (a) How many complaints about Mr Hassett were registered with the ACCC before it began investigating this case; and (b) in each instance, why was no complaint made to the state office of Consumer Affairs.

(3) Who is the most senior officer in the ACCC dealing with this issue.

Senator Kemp—The Treasurer has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) Yes. In July 1999, the Tasmanian Office of Consumer Affairs and Fair Trading informed the ACCC that there had not been any complaints about Mr Hassett or his business, Commercial and General Publications Pty Ltd (CGP).

(1) (a) The investigation proceeded because the ACCC considered that the alleged conduct of CGP and Mr Hassett potentially constituted a serious contravention of the Trade Practices Act 1974 in relation to making payment demands for unauthorised advertising.

(1) (b) The ACCC has no knowledge of, nor can it speculate, as to why complaints may not have been received or recorded by the Tasmanian Office of Consumer Affairs and Fair Trading.

(2) (a) The investigation commenced upon the receipt of an initial complaint to the ACCC from a small business person in Tasmania who had previously complained to the community organisation for which CGP was arranging publication of a magazine. The complaint raised serious allegations about the conduct of CGP and Mr Hassett. The community organisation concerned advised the ACCC of a number of similar complaints made to them about CGP and Mr Hassett.

(2) (b) Refer to the answer at (1) (b).

(3) The Regional Director of the ACCC Tasmanian office, Mr Peter Clemes, supervises all investigations carried out in the ACCC’s Tasmanian office. The matter was referred through the Regional Director to the ACCC’s Enforcement Committee in Canberra and the ACCC decided that the brief
be referred to the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). The DPP determined that prosecution was appropriate in accordance with the prosecution policy of the DPP, and proceedings were instituted after an authorisation was given in January 2001 by the ACCC’s then Acting Chairman, Mr Rod Shogren.

**Australian Taxation Office: Rulings**

*Question No. 3667*

Senator Harris asked the Assistant Treasurer, upon notice, on 28 June 2001:

(1) Can the Assistant Treasurer provide the names of the officers of the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) who recommended that favourable private rulings or favourable letters of approval be issued in the following cases:

   a) ruling for Main Camp issued over Deputy Commissioner Doughty’s name;

   b) ruling for Main Camp issued over Deputy Commissioner Foster’s name;

   c) ruling for Main Camp issued over Deputy Commissioner Nicholls’ name;

   d) ruling for Red Claw issued over Deputy Commissioner Butler’s name;

   e) ruling for Tumut River Orchard issued over Deputy Commissioner Appleton’s name;

   f) ruling for the Golden Vintage project at Forbes; and

   g) letter of approval of project shown on Four Corners on 18 June 2001, and issued by the ATO in August 1995 to accountants acting for a project.

(2) Can the Assistant Treasurer name any other co-operative investment projects that received a favourable private binding ruling in the period 1992 to 1998.

(3) (a) Why is the ATO issuing position papers that falsely accuse people of not having their cattle or their section of a project identified as theirs; and (b) is this identification requirement new law introduced in Tax Ruling 2000/08.

Senator Kemp—The answer to the honourable senator’s question is as follows:

(1) I do not propose to name individual ATO officers in connection with particular issues.

(2) Information about individuals’ tax affairs is protected by section 16 of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936. A private binding ruling only applies to an investor if it is issued to that investor, and the arrangement in respect of which it is granted is implemented in accordance with the ruling application.

   The Commissioner of Taxation recognises that some investors might have been misled by aggressive marketing techniques and claims made about the investments.

   The Commissioner has therefore announced a range of special measures designed to recognise the individual circumstances of investors in mass marketed arrangements, including the possibility of substantial reductions in penalties and interest, and for those investors who have lodged objections, a moratorium on recovery action by the ATO until after relevant test cases are decided in the courts.

   In order to facilitate the early resolution of test cases by the courts, the Commissioner has agreed to fund selected cases on at least two of the main arrangements.

   In addition, the Australian Taxation Office will work with investors who face genuine financial difficulty as a consequence of being caught up in these arrangements, to agree suitable payment terms over an appropriate period.

(3) The Commissioner of Taxation considers that the position papers represent the correct view of the tax law in relation to these matters, consistent with the view expressed in Taxation Ruling 2000/8 and earlier rulings, TR 2000/8 does not introduce new law but merely sets out what has always been the Commissioner’s view.

**Education: ‘Parents Victoria’ Postcards**

*Question No. 3671*

Senator Allison asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 29 June 2001:
(1) How many ‘Parents Victoria’ postcards were sent to the Prime Minister’s office in relation to the States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2001.

(2) Will the Federal Government increase the level of funding for government schools as requested in the postcard.

Senator Hill—The Prime Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) I am advised by my department that a total of 422 ‘Parents Victoria’ postcards had been received as at 6 July 2001.

(2) Over the 2001-04 funding quadrennium, the Commonwealth government will provide almost $9 billion in direct funding to government schools. This represents an increase of $1.8 billion, or 24 per cent, above the funding provided for government schools over the last four years (1997-2000). Direct Commonwealth funding to government schools in 2002 is estimated to be $2.2 billion, an increase of $669 million or 42% since 1996.

In relation to Victorian government schools, the Commonwealth will provide $1.9 billion in direct funding over the next four years (2001-04). This represents an increase of $365 million or 23 per cent over the 1997-2000 period. In 2002, Victorian government schools are to receive $477.2 million from the Commonwealth, which is an increase of $135.2 million or 40 per cent since 1996.

Taxation: Employee Social Security Contribution
(Question No. 3690)

Senator Allison asked the Assistant Treasurer, upon notice, on 4 July 2001:

Is the employee social security contribution still included in the taxation rate.

Senator Kemp—The answer to the honourable senator’s question is as follows:
The last year to which the social security contribution applied as a separately identifiable levy was 1949-50.
The imposition of income tax and the social service contribution at separate rates ceased as a consequence of the merging of the income tax and social services contribution legislation in 1950.

Landscape Television Program: Public Funding
(Question No. 3694)

Senator Murray asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 6 July 2001:

With reference to Prime Television’s fortnightly segment Landscape, which has featured the Prime Minister:

(1) Has any expenditure of public funds ever been involved in the production of this segment.
(2) Has the Government paid for this segment to be aired.
(3) Have the production costs or costs of airing the segment ever been borne by a political party.
(4) With reference to (1), (2) and (3), what is the amount of money involved in each case.

Senator Hill—The Prime Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

I am advised by my department as follows:

(1) to (4) No public monies have been expended in the production and airing of this programme.

British Nuclear Tests: Hospital Records
(Question No. 3711)

Senator Allison asked the Minister representing the Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 12 July 2001:

(1) Have records from the Maralinga Hospital from the time of the British nuclear tests been located; if so, will they be used in the current review of the health of servicemen involved in the tests; if not, what effort is the Government making to find the records.
(2) Has the Government asked the British Government if the records were taken to Britain.
According to records, apart from the eight small aircraft that were used for target response and buried at Maralinga, a number of modified B6 Canberra aircraft were used to collect air samples by flying through mushroom clouds of various test explosions and were highly contaminated as a result and not returned to Britain: (a) what happened to those aircraft; and (b) if they were buried, where and how did this take place.

If those aircraft were buried, does the Government propose to exhume the aircraft and transfer them to the proposed nuclear waste repository.

Senator Minchin—The Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) Maralinga Hospital records, which may still be in existence from the time of the British nuclear tests, cannot be located. The department has been advised that the Hospital records could possibly be located with the Australian War Memorial and is investigating. These documents, if located, will have no impact on the cancer and mortality study of Australian participants of the British Atomic Tests Program.

(2) The Government has not asked the British Government if the records were taken to Britain.

(3) (a) The Report of the Royal Commission into British Nuclear Tests in Australia reported that final decontamination of the RAF Canberras used for cloud sampling was carried out in the United Kingdom.

(b) The Royal Commission reported that the B6 Canberra aircraft involved in collecting air samples returned to Britain.

(4) The Royal Commission reported that the aircraft returned to Britain.

Australian Security Intelligence Organisation: Mr John Henschler

(Question No. 3712)

Senator Allison asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 12 July 2001:

In November 2000 did the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation conduct a raid on an ex-serviceman, Mr John Henschler, and confiscate film taken at Maralinga; if so: (a) where is that film now; and (b) is it available for viewing.

Senator Hill—The Prime Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

I am advised by my department as follows:

As the Honourable Senator is aware, it is the practice of Government not to make comment on ASIO’s operational activities, actual or alleged.

In this particular case however, I am advised that the ASIO has not had any involvement with a Mr John Henschler.

British Nuclear Tests: Centurion Tank

(Question No. 3717)

Senator Allison asked the Minister representing the Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 16 July 2001:

Documents retrieved from Australian Archives indicate that a Centurion Tank was irradiated at ‘ground zero’ at Maralinga and later taken to Puckapunyal. How was that vehicle disposed of.

Senator Minchin—The Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

The Report of the Royal Commission into British Nuclear Tests in Australia identified the tank used in one of the tests as Centurion tank, No. 169041. This tank has been retained as an historical vehicle and is currently located with the 1st Armoured Regiment at Robertson Barracks in Darwin.

Prime Minister and Cabinet Portfolio: Missing Computer Equipment

(Question No. 3721)

Senator Faulkner asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 25 July 2001:
(1) Have there been any desktop computers or any other item of computer hardware, other than laptop computers, lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or agencies within the portfolio during the 2000-01 financial year; if so: (a) what and how many have been lost; (b) what and how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these items; (d) what is the normal replacement value per item; and (e) have these items been recovered or replaced.

(2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents; if so: (a) how many were the subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has this action been concluded and with what result.

(3) How many of these lost or stolen items had departmental documents, content or information other than operating software on their hard disc drives, floppy disc, CD Rom or any other storage device.

(4) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) were classified for security or any other purpose; and (b) if any, what was the security classification involved.

(5) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents etc. in (4) have been recovered.

(6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the items in (1) or in relation to the documents etc. in (3) or (4).

Senator Hill—The Prime Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

I am advised by my department that the answer in respect of the portfolio is as follows:

(1) Yes
   (a) One personal computer, one monitor and one external tape drive could not be accounted for by the Public Service and Merit Protection Commission (PSMPC).
   (b) Nil.
   (c) Total value of the items written off by PSMPC was $415.
   (d) The approximate replacement value of the equipment is $3,580.
   (e) These items have not been recovered or replaced.

(2) No.

(3) Nil.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) Nil.

Foreign Affairs and Trade Portfolio: Missing Computer Equipment
(Questions Nos 3724 and 3728)

Senator Faulkner asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Minister for Trade, upon notice, on 25 July 2001:

(1) Have there been any desktop computers or any other item of computer hardware, other than laptop computers, lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or agencies within the portfolio during the 2000-01 financial year; if so: (a) what and how many have been lost; (b) what and how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these items; (d) what is the normal replacement value per item; and (e) have these items been recovered or replaced.

(2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents; if so: (a) how many were the subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has this action been concluded and with what result.

(3) How many of these lost or stolen items had departmental documents, content or information other than operating software on their hard disc drives, floppy disc, CD Rom or any other storage device.
(4) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) were classified for security or any other purpose; and
   (b) if any, what was the security classification involved.

(5) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents etc.
   in (4) have been recovered.

(6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the items in (1) or in
   relation to the documents etc. in (3) or (4).

Senator Hill—The Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Minister for Trade have provided
the following answers to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) No.

(2) to (6) Not applicable.

Education, Training and Youth Affairs Portfolio: Missing Computer Equipment
(Question No. 3731)

Senator Faulkner asked the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Training
and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 25 July 2001:

(1) Have there been any desktop computers or any other item of computer hardware, other than laptop
   computers, lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or agencies
   within the portfolio during the 2000-01 financial year; if so: (a) what and how many have been
   lost; (b) what and how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these items; (d) what
   is the normal replacement value per item; and (e) have these items been recovered or replaced.

(2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents; if so: (a) how many were the
   subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in
   how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has this action been
   concluded and with what result.

(3) How many of these lost or stolen items had departmental documents, content or information other
   than operating software on their hard disc drives, floppy disc, CD Rom or any other storage de-
   vice.

(4) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) were classified for security or any other purpose; and
   (b) if any, what was the security classification involved.

(5) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents etc.
   in (4) have been recovered.

(6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the items in (1) or in
   relation to the documents etc. in (3) or (4).

Senator Ellison—The Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs has provided the
following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) During the 2000-01 financial year:
   (a) No items have been lost.
   (b) (i) 2 personal computers; (ii) 1 CD burner; (iii) 1 Central ProcessingUnit; (iv) 1 hard drive;
      and (v) 1 memory card were stolen.
   (c) Total value is $9,634 (depreciated).
   (d) (i) $3,800; (ii) $500; (iii) $800; (iv) $175; and (v) $180.
   (e) No items have been recovered, all have been replaced.

(2) (a) Two incidents were subject to police investigations.
   (b) Nil.
   (c) Nil.
   (d) Nil.

(3) Nil.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) Nil.
Industry, Science and Resources Portfolio: Missing Computer Equipment
(Question No. 3732)

Senator Faulkner asked the Minister for Industry, Science and Resources, upon notice, on 25 July 2001:

(1) Have there been any desktop computers, or any other item of computer hardware, other than lap-
top computers, lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or any agencies within the portfolio during the 2000-01 financial year; if so: (a) what and how many have been lost; (b) what and how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these items; (d) what is the normal replacement value per item; and (e) have these computers been recovered or replaced.

(2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents; if so: (a) how many were the subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has action been concluded and with what result.

(3) How many of the lost or stolen items had departmental documents, content or information other than operating software on their hard disc drives, floppy disc, CD-ROM or any other storage device.

(4) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) were classified for security or any other purpose and (b) if any, what was the security classification involved.

(5) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents etc. in (4) have been recovered.

(6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the items in (1) or in relation to the documents etc. in (3) or (4).

Senator Minchin—The answer to the honourable senator’s question is as follows:

The Department and agencies of my portfolio advise me of the following information on the loss and theft of desktop computers or other items of computer hardware during the 2000-2001 financial year:

Department of Industry, Science and Resources

(1) Yes;
   (a) 2 desktop computers;
   (b) None;
   (c) Items were fully depreciated;
   (d) Estimated $2,000 per desktop computer;
   (e) No.

(2) No.

(3) It is likely that the desktop computers, which were both old computers, contained documents, content or information other than operating software, however the Department is not able to confirm the presence of such material on the lost items.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) A range of Departmental action has been taken in regard to lost equipment, including:
   • asset recording and control procedures have been reviewed and upgrades implemented to improve asset management; and
   • responsible officers have been reminded of the detailed procedures for safeguarding assets which are set out in the Chief Executive Instructions.

Australian Government Analytical Laboratories

(1) No.

Australian Survey and Land Information Group

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
(b) 8 desktop monitors;
(c) $17,015;
(d) $2,127 per desktop monitor;
(e) Yes, replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 8 (two separate incidents involving 4 monitors each incident);
   (b) None;
   (c) None;
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) Not applicable.
(4) Not applicable.
(5) Not applicable.
(6) After an internal review, supplementary security was put in place in the Scrivener Building in Canberra.

**IP Australia**

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 1 interface card;
   (c) $120;
   (d) $120;
   (e) No.

(2) No.
(3) Not applicable.
(4) Not applicable.
(5) Not applicable.
(6) Interface card was a component of a desktop computer. The remainder of the unit was used as spare parts.

**Australian Tourist Commission**

(1) No.

**National Standards Commission**

(1) No.

**Australian Institute of Marine Science**

(1) No.

**Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation**

(1) No.

**Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation**

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 3 desktop computers;
   (c) $5,500;
   (d) $1,760 per desktop computer (purchase) or $220 per quarter (lease);
   (e) No.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 3 incidents;
   (b) 3 investigations concluded;
(c) No legal action has commenced due to a lack of evidence to identify subjects;
(d) Not applicable.

(3) None.
(4) Not applicable.
(5) Not applicable.
(6) In all 3 incidents, subsequent internal investigations recommended no agency discipline because the thefts were the result of break and enter by person(s) unknown and not negligence on the part of the Organisation or its officers.
A review of security procedures was conducted after each incident with the view to improve the existing stringent security measures.

AGSO - Geoscience Australia

(1) Yes;
   (a) 1 docking station;
   (b) 2 CD drives, 2 zip drives and 1 floppy drive;
   (c) $1,835;
   (d) Approximately $400 each CD drive; approximately $350 each zip drive. Replacement values of the lost docking station and the stolen floppy drive are not available as these items were not replaced by the agency;
   (e) Docking station was lost in transit and replaced at no charge. No stolen items were recovered or replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) None;
   (c) None;
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) None.
(4) Not applicable.
(5) Not applicable.
(6) With regard to the lost docking station, the airline was contacted, confirmation was sought and obtained that extensive tracing action had been carried out by the airline. An offer from the airline to replace the docking station was accepted.
With regard to the stolen items, and extensive in-house search for two of the stolen drives was conducted, security access logs were checked and staff questioned.

Australian Sports Commission

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 1 desktop computer;
   (c) Item was fully depreciated;
   (d) Approximately $2,000 per desktop computer;
   (e) Not recovered; likely to have been replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 1 police investigation;
   (b) The Commission is not aware of any concluded investigations;
   (c) None of which the Commission is aware;
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) Although no central records are kept on the documents held on Commission desktop computers, it is likely that the computers in question would have contained working documents.
(4) (a) The Commission does not have detailed information on the nature of all documents contained on the computers in question. Working documents are generally unclassified;
(b) Not applicable.
(5) (a) None;
(b) None.
(6) No disciplinary action has been required.

**Australian Sports Drug Agency**

(1) No.

**Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet: Missing Laptop Computers**

*(Question No. 3740)*

Senator Faulkner asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 25 July 2001:

(1) Have there been any laptop computers lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or agencies within the portfolio during the 2000-01 financial year; if so: (a) how many have been lost; (b) how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these computers; (d) what is the average replacement value per computer; and (e) have these computers been recovered or replaced.

(2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents; if so: (a) how many were the subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has this action been concluded and with what result.

(3) How many of these lost or stolen computers had departmental documents, content or information other than operating software on their hard disc drives, floppy disc, CD Rom or any other storage device.

(4) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) were classified for security or any other purpose; and (b) if any, what was the security classification involved.

(5) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents etc. in (4) have been recovered.

(6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the computers in (1) or in relation to the documents etc. in (3) or (4).

Senator Hill—The Prime Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

I am advised by my department that the answer in respect of the portfolio is as follows:

(1) Yes.
(a) Nil.
(b) A total of five (5) laptops were stolen:
   • one laptop from the office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman;
   • two laptops from the Public Service and Merit Protection Commission (PSMPC);
   • one laptop from the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO); and
   • one laptop from the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C).
(c) Total value of these laptops is $6,949 excluding the laptops stolen from PSMPC and PM&C which were leased items.
(d) The average replacement value per laptop is $3,474.
(e) None of the laptops has been recovered. The laptop stolen from the Ombudsman’s office is being replaced; the laptops stolen from PSMPC and PM&C have been replaced; and the laptop from the ANAO has not been replaced.

(2) Yes.
(a) All incidents were subject to police investigation.
(b) No investigations have been concluded.
(c) Nil.
(d) Not applicable.

(3) and (4) Two laptops contained departmental data (PM&C and ANAO). No documents had national security classifications. The ANAO laptop contained one document classified as Commercial-In-Confidence. All PM&C laptops encrypt information on the hard disks.

(5) (a) Nil.
(b) Nil.

(6) ANAO has strengthened its policy on the security of laptops and staff are reminded periodically about the importance of adhering to proper security procedures when using and transporting laptops.

**Treasury Portfolio: Missing Laptop Computers**

*(Question No. 3742)*

**Senator Faulkner** asked the Minister representing the Treasurer, upon notice, on 25 July 2001:

(1) Have there been any laptop computers lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or agencies within the portfolio during the 2000-01 financial year; if so (a) how many have been lost; (b) how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these computers; (d) what is the average replacement value per computer; and (e) have these computers been recovered or replaced.

(2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents; if so: (a) how many were the subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has this action been concluded and with what result.

(3) How many of these lost or stolen computers had departmental documents, content or information other than operating software on their hard disc drives, floppy disc, CD Rom or any other storage device.

(4) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) were classified for security or any other purpose; and (b) if any, what was the security classification involved.

(5) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents etc. in (4) have been recovered.

(6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the items in (1) or in relation to the documents etc. in (3) or (4).

**Senator Kemp**—The Treasurer has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

**Treasury**

(1) Yes
   (a) None
   (b) One
   (c) $2,100 (depreciated value)
   (d) $4,215
   (e) Replaced.

(2) No
   (a) None
   (b) N/A
   (c) N/A
   (d) N/A

(3) None
(4) N/A
   (a) N/A
(b) N/A

(5) N/A
   (a) N/A
   (b) N/A

6) No disciplinary action was undertaken. However, a Staff notice ‘Security Awareness – Safeguarding the Workplace and Personal Belongings’ was issued to all staff.

**Australian Bureau of Statistics**

(1) Yes
   (a) Nil
   (b) 5
   (c) $15,950
   (d) $5,500
   (e) 1 recovered, 4 replaced

(2) Yes
   (a) 4
   (b) 4
   (c) Nil
   (d) Nil

(3) 5 (HDD only)

(4) (a) and (b) Not Applicable

(5) (a) and (b) Not Applicable

(6) Nil

**Australian Competition & Consumers Commission**

(1) Yes
   (a) None lost
   (b) 2 stolen
   (c) Unknown as the equipment is owned by IT Outsourced provider
   (d) Unknown as the equipment is owned by IT Outsourced provider
   (e) Yes replaced by Outsourced provider

(2) Yes
   (a) 2
   (b) None
   (c) None
   (d) None

(3) None

(4) (a) and (b) Not Applicable

(5) (a) and (b) Not Applicable

(6) None

**Australian Prudential Regulatory Authority**

(1) Yes
   (a) 1 lost
   (b) 2 stolen
   (c) $12,780
   (d) $4,980
   (e) 3
Australian Securities & Investments Commission
(1) to (6) None
Companies and Securities Advisory Committee
(1) to (6) None
National Competition Council
(1) to (6) None
Productivity Commission
(1) to (6) None

Foreign Affairs and Trade Portfolio: Missing Laptop Computers
(Questions Nos 3743 and 3747)

Senator Faulkner asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the
Minister for Trade, upon notice, on 25 July 2001:

(1) Have there been any laptop computers lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the de-
partment and/or agencies within the portfolio during the 2000-01 financial year; if so: (a) how
many have been lost; (b) how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these comput-
ers; (d) what is the average replacement value per computer; and (e) have these computers been
recovered or replaced.

(2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents; if so: (a) how many were the
subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in
how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has this action been
concluded and with what result.

(3) How many of these lost or stolen computers had departmental documents, content or information
other than operating software on their hard disc drives, floppy disc, CD Rom or any other storage
device.

(4) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) were classified for security or any other purpose; and
(b) if any, what was the security classification involved.

(5) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents etc.
in (4) have been recovered.

(6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the computers in (1)
or in relation to the documents etc. in (3) or (4).

Senator Hill—The Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Minister for Trade have provided
the following answers to the honourable senator’s questions:

(1) No.
(2) to (6) Not applicable.

Education, Training and Youth Affairs Portfolio: Missing Laptop Computers
(Question No. 3750)

Senator Faulkner asked the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Training
and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 25 July 2001:
(1) Have there been any laptop computers lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or agencies within the portfolio during the 2000-01 financial year; if so: (a) how many have been lost; (b) how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these computers; (d) what is the average replacement value per computer; and (e) have these computers been recovered or replaced.

(2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents; if so: (a) how many were the subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has this action been concluded and with what result.

(3) How many of these lost or stolen computers had departmental documents, content or information other than operating software on their hard disc drives, floppy disc, CD Rom or any other storage device.

(4) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) were classified for security or any other purpose; and (b) if any, what was the security classification involved.

(5) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents etc. in (4) have been recovered.

(6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the computers in (1) or in relation to the documents etc. in (3) or (4).

Senator Ellison—The Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) During the 2000-01 financial year:
   (a) No items have been lost.
   (b) 7 laptop computers were stolen.
   (c) Total value is $2,980 (depreciated).
   (d) $4,000.
   (e) No items have been recovered, all have been replaced.

(2) (a) All were subject to police investigations.
   (b) Nil.
   (c) Nil.
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) Nil.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) Nil.

**Industry, Science and Resources Portfolio: Missing Laptop Computers**

*(Question No. 3751)*

Senator Faulkner asked the Minister for Industry, Science and Resources, upon notice, on 25 July 2001:

(1) Have there been any laptop computers lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or any agencies within the portfolio during the 2000-01 financial year; if so: (a) how many have been lost; (b) how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these computers; (d) what is the average replacement value per computer; and (e) have these computers been recovered or replaced.

(2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents; if so: (a) how many were the subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has this action been concluded and with what result.

(3) How many of these lost or stolen computers had departmental documents, content or information other than operating software on their hard disc drives, floppy disc, CD-ROM or any other storage device.
(4) (a) How many of the documents etc. referred to in (3) were classified for security or any other purpose and (b) if any, what was the security classification involved.

(5) (a) How many of the documents etc. in (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents etc. in (4) have been recovered.

(6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the computers in (1) or in relation to the documents etc. in (3) or (4).

Senator Minchin—The answer to the honourable senator’s question is as follows:

The Department and agencies of my portfolio advise me of the following information on the loss and theft of laptop computers during the 2000-2001 financial year:

Department of Industry, Science and Resources

(1) Yes;
   (a) 3 laptops;
   (b) 5 laptops;
   (c) $8,972 (this is an estimate only as 3 of the laptops were leased from a third party);
   (d) $3,825 (this is an estimate only as most computer hardware in the Department is leased);
   (e) 1 laptop has been recovered; 4 laptops have been replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 5 incidents;
   (b) 1 concluded investigation of which the Department is aware;
   (c) None of which the Department is aware;
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) It is likely that lost or stolen laptops with storage devices have portfolio documents, content or information other than operating software. The Department is able to confirm the presence of such material on one stolen laptop.

(4) (a) 1 document;
   (b) Cabinet-in-Confidence.

(5) (a) None;
   (b) None.

(6) A range of Departmental action has been taken in regard to lost and stolen equipment, including:
   - all staff have been reminded of their personal liability if they are negligent in protecting Commonwealth assets in their possession;
   - some Departmental officers have been asked to explain why they should not be required to make a contribution to the replacement cost of stolen laptops; and
   - responsible officers have been reminded of the detailed procedures for safeguarding assets which are set out in the Chief Executive Instructions.

With regard to the classified document on a laptop stolen from a private residence, the incident was reported to the police, the Minister’s Chief of Staff and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade on the day of the theft.

Australian Government Analytical Laboratories

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 1 laptop;
   (c) $300 (this is an estimate only as the laptop was leased from a third party);
   (d) $4,400 (this is an estimate only as most of the computer hardware in the agency is leased);
   (e) 1 laptop replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 1 police investigation;
   (b) None of which the agency is aware;
(c) Not applicable;
(d) Not applicable.
(3) The laptop had information stored on the hard drive.
(4) None.
(5) (a) None of the documents, content or information referred to in (3) have been recovered;
(b) Not applicable.
(6) No agency disciplinary or other action was taken.

**Australian Survey and Land Information Group**

(1) No.
(2) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 1 laptop;
   (c) $5,141;
   (d) $5,141;
   (e) 1 replaced.

**IP Australia**

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 1 laptop;
   (c) $5,141;
   (d) $5,141;
   (e) 1 replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 1 police investigation;
   (b) 1 concluded investigation;
   (c) No legal action;
   (d) Not applicable.

**Australian Tourist Commission**

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 5 laptops;
   (c) $15,822 (this is an estimate only as most of the laptops were leased);
   (d) $4,000 (estimate only of average replacement value for a laptop);
   (e) No laptops have been recovered; 5 laptops have been replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 5 police investigations;
   (b) 5 concluded investigations;
   (c) None;
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) None.
(4) Not applicable.
(5) Not applicable.
(6) The Commission has introduced a Security Policy that deals with the use of portable hardware such as laptops, which ensures that they are locked securely after use, and users are aware of their responsibilities.

**National Standards Commission**
(1) No.

**Australian Institute of Marine Science**

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 1 laptop;
   (c) $5,297;
   (d) Average replacement value is $5,837 per laptop;
   (e) 1 laptop replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 1 police investigation;
   (b) 1 concluded investigation;
   (c) None;
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) None.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) No disciplinary action taken.

**Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation**

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 1 laptop;
   (c) $3,200;
   (e) 1 replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 1 police investigation;
   (b) None;
   (c) Not applicable;
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) The laptop contained a number of scientific programs and several working documents.

(4) None.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) No disciplinary action was taken although the officer involved will take further precautions. Copies of the working documents were recovered from the agency server.

**Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation**

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 17 laptops;
   (c) $82,185;
   (d) Average replacement value is $4,500 per laptop (purchase) or $500 per quarter (lease);
   (e) 6 laptops have been recovered; 4 laptops have been replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 17 incidents;
   (b) 16 concluded investigations;
   (c) Commencement of legal action in 1 case;
   (d) The above case is still in progress.
(3) None.
(4) Not applicable.
(5) Not applicable.
(6) In all 17 incidents, subsequent internal investigations recommended no agency discipline because the thefts were the result of illegal actions by person(s) unknown and not negligence on the part of the agency or its officers.

A review of security procedures was conducted after each incident with the view to improve existing stringent security measures.

**AGSO - Geoscience Australia**

(1) No.

**Australian Sports Commission**

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 12 laptops;
   (c) $12,853;
   (d) Approximately $4,400 per laptop;
   (e) None recovered; most likely to have been replaced.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 12 police investigations;
   (b) None of which the Commission is aware;
   (c) None of which the Commission is aware;
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) Although no central records are kept on the documents held on ASC laptop computers, it is likely that the computers in question would have contained working documents.

(4) The Commission does not have detailed information on the nature of all documents contained on the computers in question. Working documents are generally unclassified.

(5) (a) None.
   (b) None.

(6) No disciplinary action has been required.

**Australian Sports Drug Agency**

(1) Yes;
   (a) None;
   (b) 1 laptop;
   (c) $5,532;
   (d) Approximately $6,500 per laptop;
   (e) No.

(2) Yes;
   (a) 1 police investigation;
   (b) No concluded investigations;
   (c) Not applicable;
   (d) Not applicable.

(3) It is likely that the laptop had agency documents, content or information other than operating software on its storage device. The agency is not able to confirm the presence of such material on the stolen laptop.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) No disciplinary action
Senators’ and Members’ Electoral Entitlements
(Question No. 3783)

Senator Harris asked the Minister representing the Minister for Finance and Administration, upon notice, on 27 July 2001:

(1) Must a senator or member use a residential address for electoral roll enrolment purposes even if the address is located outside the boundaries of the electorate that he or she represents.

(2) Is a member who lives in a capital city but represents a rural electorate able to use his or her electoral office address for the electoral roll.

(3) May senators or members vote in federal elections in the divisions they represent even though they do not reside in those electorates.

(4) If senators or members live outside the divisions that they represent, can they use a private-plated vehicle to commute to a polling booth in those divisions; if so, will the Department cover the associated costs.

(5) Do electoral allowances and other entitlements differ between senators and members.

(6) Is a member allowed to drive a private-plated vehicle outside his or her electorate on electorate business; if so, will the Department cover the associated costs.

Senator Abetz—The Minister for Finance and Administration has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) A Senator or Member may be enrolled only for the address at which he or she resides. A Member may, nevertheless, be enrolled for that address on the roll of electors for the electoral division which he or she represents even if the address is not within the boundaries of that division. A Senator may be enrolled for that address on the roll of electors for any electoral division in the State or Territory which he or she represents even if the address is not within the boundaries of that division. In cases where there are subdivisional rolls, a Senator or Member may be enrolled for an appropriate subdivisional roll.

(2) No.

(3) Yes. A Senator or Member may vote in a federal election for an electoral division he or she represents so long as they are enrolled for that division.

(4) Clause 5.7 of Remuneration Tribunal Determination No. 26 of 1998 provides that a Senator or Member may use the private plated vehicle provided at Government expense for parliamentary, electorate or official business, family travel and private purposes but not for commercial purposes.

(5) Yes.

(6) Please see answer to (4) above.

Education: Teachers and Funding
(Question No. 3789)

Senator Allison asked the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 2 August 2001:

(1) (a) What formula is used in determining funding, under the Australian Student Traineeship Foundation, for schools; and (b) why is it that schools in Wodonga receive less per capita than those in other schools, for instance, Wangaratta.

(2) (a) What federal assistance is available for secondary students in rural areas to access study skills, revision and other tertiary preparation courses; (b) is the Government aware that such courses conducted by universities for students in rural areas are shorter and less comprehensive than those offered to city-based students; and (c) how does the Government propose to address this inequitable situation.

(3) (a) Is there a 20 per cent disparity in wages between teachers in New South Wales and Victoria, and is this causing severe shortages of teachers in Victoria, particularly in areas close to the state border; and (b) has the Federal Government raised this issue with the state governments; if so, what were the outcomes of such discussions.
(4) (a) Is it extremely difficult for rural schools to recruit technology teachers; (b) what measures has the Federal Government adopted to overcome this shortage; and (c) when can schools expect to have access to an adequate supply of technology teachers.

Senator Ellison—The Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) (a) (b) The Enterprise and Career Education Foundation (formerly the Australian Student Traineeship Foundation) does not provide funding for individual schools. Funding levels for individual programmes such as the Albury Wodonga Vocational Education and Training (VET) in Schools programme are reached after an extensive process of deliberations and consultations with advisory committees representing education and industry at state and territory level. Eligibility for funding is determined on specified criteria and accountability prerequisites in relation to past performance.

(2) (a) The Commonwealth, through the Country Areas Programme (CAP) recognises that primary and secondary students in rural and geographically isolated areas face educational disadvantage due to distance. The CAP contributes to the enhancement of quality learning and aims to give these students the opportunity to improve their educational opportunities and learning outcomes. Under the CAP, the Commonwealth provides an additional $20 million annually to State and Northern Territory government and non-government education authorities to assist eligible schools to overcome distance barriers to education. The State and Territory education authorities have the flexibility to determine the allocation of CAP funds according to the priorities identified by them, utilising their knowledge of local need, provided they comply with CAP guidelines. Education authorities can allocate funds to schools for initiatives/activities which support secondary students in making the transition to further education, training and work including vocational education and training and work experience.

Students with rural or isolated home backgrounds are eligible to undertake enabling courses provided by many universities to assist educationally disadvantaged students from identified equity groups. The majority of these courses are tertiary preparation (bridging) courses and are HECS-exempt.

(b) and (c) The Government is not aware of data showing that enabling courses conducted by universities for students in rural areas are shorter and less comprehensive than those offered to city-based students.

(3) (a) Based on an examination of publicly available teacher salary scales for the New South Wales (NSW) and Victorian government sector, there does not appear to be a 20 per cent disparity between NSW and Victorian government sector teacher salaries. The two salary scales are not comparable across all levels. However, Victorian government teacher salary levels appear to be higher than NSW government teacher salary levels at the three-year trained entry point (5 per cent more than NSW), the four-year trained entry point (nearly 3 per cent more than NSW) and at the highest salary level (nearly 4 per cent more than NSW, when comparing the highest step for the Victorian ‘Experienced Teachers with Responsibility’ with Step 13 of the NSW scale).

State governments are responsible for the management of teaching labour market issues. Any disparities in comparable salaries between cross-border regions such as those mentioned with NSW and Victoria are the responsibility of the respective States.

(b) The Commonwealth has not raised this issue with State governments. Teachers’ salaries are primarily a matter for teacher employers (and, where relevant, individual schools and teachers in the non-government sector), to determine within the workplace relations framework applying in each State and Territory.

(4) (a) It is generally acknowledged that education authorities and schools face recruitment difficulties for both teachers of technology, including information technology, and also more generally for teachers who are prepared to teach in rural and remote areas. The National and State Skills Shortage List maintained by the Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business indicates that Victoria faces State-wide secondary teacher shortages in Technical and Industrial Arts and in Information Technology. It indicates a similar position for NSW, Queensland and South Australia but not in the remaining States and Territories.

(b) The responsibility for the employment and placement of teachers lies with State and Territory government and non-government education authorities and individual schools. However the
Commonwealth participates in the relevant Taskforce of the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) which relates to teacher quality issues and the associated National Teacher Supply and Demand Working Party. The 2000 Report of the Working Party has been endorsed by MCEETYA and is expected to be publicly available soon.

In the Government’s Innovation Action Plan, Backing Australia’s Ability, there is an undertaking to review teaching and teacher education to ensure that talented young people are attracted to teaching as a career, especially in the fields of science and technology education.

The Government is currently considering how best to initiate this review, which will be conducted in conjunction with State and Territory governments.

In addition, CAP funds may be utilised to provide professional development and support to address the particular development needs of teachers in rural and geographically isolated areas including those in the field of information technology.

(c) The Commonwealth is not responsible for the employment and placement of teachers. This is a matter for government and non-government teacher employers in States and Territories, who work with higher education institutions and put in place arrangements, which could include incentives, to ensure that schools have an adequate number of teachers in technology and other learning areas.

Commonwealth Departments and Agencies: Green Energy Policy
(Questions Nos 3793-3798 and 3800-3811)

Senator Allison asked all ministers, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:

(1) Does the department have a policy on purchasing ‘green energy’ or energy from renewable sources for its own operations.

(2) What, if any, are the constraints for agencies in purchasing ‘green energy’.

(3) What steps does the department take to promote the purchase of ‘green energy’ in its agencies.

(4) (a)How much ‘green energy’ was purchased, and by which agencies, for the 2000-01 financial year; and (b) how does this compare with the previous financial year.

Senator Hill—The following answer to the honourable senator’s question is on behalf of all ministers, excluding the Minister for Defence:

(1) The Commonwealth Energy Policy applies to all Commonwealth departments and to Commonwealth agencies and bodies whose operations are substantially budget-dependent. This policy states that opportunities to use renewable energy be identified, and adopted, where cost effective.

(2) Agencies may be constrained by the amount of ‘green energy’ that is available to the market and by the cost of that energy.

(3) The Australian Greenhouse Office (AGO) is currently negotiating an agreement for Commonwealth agencies within the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) (excluding the Dept of Defence) that includes a minimum quantity of green energy from accredited sources (5 giga watt hours per annum, GWh/a of approximately 180GWh/a). As part of the current contract negotiations, the AGO and Environment Australia are seeking the procurement of 100% accredited green energy (1.75GWh/a) for their tenancies at the John Gorton Building.

(4) (a)Within the ACT most of the Commonwealth government electricity requirements were covered in two contracts with ActewAGL in 2000-01 – one with the Department of Defence and the other the AGO (the agreement is also known as Domestic Property Group contract).

Under the AGO contract, from September 1999 to 30 June 2001, Environment Australia and the AGO used 100% green power. For other agencies accessing green power on a voluntary basis, the best estimate is that 3% is coming from renewable sources.

(b) No easily accessible, accurate data is available on Commonwealth consumption of green energy outside the ACT for 1999-2000.

Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs: Reports
(Question No. 3813)

Senator Carr asked the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:
(1) Is the Minister aware that the department was only able to provide, in March 2001, a partial answer to question E299, asked on 22 February 2001 at an additional estimates hearing.

(2) Is the Minister aware that while the department was able to provide copies of 31 reports sought through question E299, 13 reports were withheld subject to ministerial and/or departmental acceptance or clearance while a further four had not been provided as the Minister had yet to indicate whether he wished them to be withheld on the grounds of public interest disclosure.

(3) Can the Minister advise whether, after a further 4 months, he has been consulted on all these outstanding documents and if so, the date on which he was consulted.

(4) Can the Minister further indicate whether he has determined to withhold any documents on the grounds of public interest immunity and, if so, provide the full title of each of these documents.

(5) Can the Minister advise whether it is normal practice for departmental or ministerial acceptance procedures for reports to take in excess of 10 months or is this another example of the inefficiency that has afflicted the department in so many recent programs.

(6) Can the Minister confirm departmental advice that, despite its assurance in March that ‘this clearance process is currently underway’, no full answer to question E299 will be available until September 2001 and provide a detailed explanation as to why such an unsatisfactory period of time will elapse between the original request and a full answer.

Senator Ellison—The Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) Question E299 was not provided as a partial answer. The Question asked about availability of the reports at 22 February 2001, the status of these reports was correct at the time the question was provided. Updates on these reports is also occurring in response to Question E46 asked at the Senate Estimates Hearing of 6 and 7 June 2001 and is to be provided in September 2001.

(2) Yes. The Minister was aware of these reports and their availability status at April 2001.

(3) Please see Attachment A for details.

(4) Yes. The Minister has determined to withhold the report by KMPG Management Consulting “Review of Emerging Accounting Issues on the Recurrent Costs of Schooling” on the grounds of public interest immunity.

Seven other reports are pending clearance by the Minister in regard to their availability.

(5) Many of these reports required input from external partner agencies or committee members prior to provision to the Minister. The finalisation of some reports is contingent on the finalisation of other work, including other reports. In addition, report finalisation is also subject to competing resource priorities in the Department. As a result of these factors, delays may occur in Ministerial release.

(6) The statement that “This clearance process is currently underway” (paragraph 7 of E299), was made exclusively in reference to one report, a report for KPMG Consulting Pty Ltd – “Evaluation of the Work Placement Co-ordination in Schools funding provided to the Australian Student Traineeship Foundation. This report was cleared by the Minister in May 2001 for availability on request and eight copies are provided in response to this PQ.

ATTACHMENT A – PQ 3813

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMISe PRN</th>
<th>Consultant/General Service Contractor</th>
<th>Contract Description</th>
<th>Availability @ 6 August 2001</th>
<th>(a) Has the Minister been consulted between April 2001 and August 2001 on the outstanding nature of this document?</th>
<th>(b) If the Minister was consulted, the date he was consulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRN00532</td>
<td>Global Learning Services</td>
<td>Investigation of Participation in Information Technology (IT) in Education, Training and Employment</td>
<td>Available (8 copies attached)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29 May 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMISe PRN</td>
<td>Contract Description</td>
<td>Availability @ 6 August 2001</td>
<td>(3a) Has the Minister been consulted between April 2001 and August 2001 on the outstanding nature of this document?</td>
<td>(3b) If the Minister was consulted, the date he was consulted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00624</td>
<td>Griffith University Evaluation of the GLOBE Australia Programme</td>
<td>Available on acceptance by the Department and release by the Minister</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00712</td>
<td>Global Learning Services Develop a project plan to implement a Rural Cross-Industry New Apprenticeship</td>
<td>Available (8 copies attached)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27 April 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00537</td>
<td>IDP Extent to which Australian Qualifications are formally Recognised for the entry into Specific Professions n India, Indonesia, Korea and Taiwan</td>
<td>Available on acceptance by the Department and release by the Minister</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 July 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00469</td>
<td>KPMG Consulting Pty Ltd Evaluation of the Work Placement Co-ordination in Schools funding provided to the Australian Student Traineeship Foundation.</td>
<td>The final report is available on request (8 copies attached), but has not been publicly released.</td>
<td>The Minister was briefed in May 2001 and agreed in June 2001 to make the report available on request.</td>
<td>The Minister was briefed in May 2001 and agreed in June 2001 to make the report available on request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00615</td>
<td>KPMG Management Consulting Pty Ltd Review of emerging accounting issues on the recurrent costs of schooling</td>
<td>Not Available, report subject to public interest immunity claim</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 June 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00611</td>
<td>National Curriculum Services Mapping Teacher Professional Development</td>
<td>Available (8 copies attached)</td>
<td>Minister approved public release of report</td>
<td>Minister approved release on 5/12/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00603</td>
<td>Price Waterhouse Coopers Provision of Advice on Establishment and Operation of Fidelity Funds</td>
<td>Available (8 copies attached)</td>
<td>The Minister was not consulted.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00608</td>
<td>Rayndawn (trading as Do ran Consulting Services) Provision of Information on the costs associated with Fidelity Funds</td>
<td>Available (8 copies attached)</td>
<td>The Minister was not consulted.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00550</td>
<td>Southern Cross Regional Institute Strengthening the Knowledge Contribution of the University to the Economic Competitiveness of the report not yet completed (extension granted till 30/03/02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMISe PRN</td>
<td>Consultant/General Service Contractor</td>
<td>Contract Description</td>
<td>Availability @ 6 August 2001</td>
<td>(3a) Has the Minister been consulted between April 2001 and August 2001 on the outstanding nature of this document?</td>
<td>(3b) If the Minister was consulted, the date he was consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00587</td>
<td>Stride Consulting Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Issues and Opportunities in International Education</td>
<td>Available on acceptance by the Department and release by the Minister</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00377</td>
<td>Worthington Di Marzio Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Market Research for the New Apprenticeships campaign</td>
<td>Available on acceptance by the Department and release by the Minister</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 June 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00414</td>
<td>Australian Council for Educational Research Limited (ACER)</td>
<td>National Project Manager for OECD PISA</td>
<td>The International Report will be available on release by the OECD, scheduled for 4 December 2001</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00448</td>
<td>Centre for Social Research - Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Research on How to Generate Better Educational and Employment Opportunities for Rural Young People' Why Students From China Choose Countries Other Than Australia for International Study</td>
<td>Available on acceptance by the Department and release by the Minister</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24 August 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00379</td>
<td>Curtin University of Technology</td>
<td>Why Students From China Choose Countries Other Than Australia for International Study</td>
<td>Available (8 copies attached)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 July 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00437</td>
<td>Education Department of Western Australia</td>
<td>A trial of 30 Western Australian Government schools of approaches to implementing local management of schools.</td>
<td>Available (8 copies attached)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 August 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN00578</td>
<td>KPMG Consulting Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Comparison of Qualifications offered by Australia/Relative Standing of Quals in Malaysia and Thailand</td>
<td>Available on acceptance by the Department and release by the Minister</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN01488</td>
<td>Real Options</td>
<td>Devis, trial, evaluate and provide for implementation up to</td>
<td>Available (8 copies attached)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>June 2001, July 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senator Schacht asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 7 August 2001:

With reference to the following exchange in an Estimates hearing on 6 June 2001: Question: Why was material relating to allegations of a security breach destroyed. Answer: The DIO officer who made the allegations was physically located at a United States military base. He told investigators that he decided it was best to destroy the DFAT AUSTEO cables, as he was unable to provide the required level of protection necessary for such documents.

(1) Does the department accept the DIO officer’s explanation that it was deemed best to destroy important documents due to insufficient security?

(2) What is the reason that the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade cannot provide adequate security to protect AUSTEO Cables on the said United States military base?

(3) Has a review been carried out in order to determine whether the above situation is occurring elsewhere?

(4) Has the Government taken steps to ensure that this security deficiency will not occur again?

Senator Hill—The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) Yes.

(2) The Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade cannot provide security for cables at the base because it does not have a presence there. The Department of Defence has a facility at the base, but the security environment is not adequate for handling AUSTEO cables. Because of this, there was no authority for the documents in question to be at the base.

(3) No.

(4) To prevent future security deficiencies of any kind, late last year the Government issued Commonwealth-wide minimum standards for storing and transmitting national security classified material. They are contained in the Protective Security Manual 2000.

Environment: Lithium Batteries (Question No. 3829)

Senator Brown asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 7 August 2001:

(1) What impact does the disposal of lithium batteries have on the environment.

(2) What do camera shops currently do with used batteries.

(3) (a) What program does the Government have to minimise the environmental impacts of lithium batteries;

(b) Is there a recycling program; and
(c) Is there a program to prevent used batteries being dumped.

Senator Hill—The answer to the honourable senator’s question is as follows:

(1) The impact of the disposal of lithium batteries on the environment varies with the type of battery and their disposal.

For example, many lithium batteries utilise hazardous organic solvents as a liquid cathode. Such organic solvents are generally considered hazardous because they are flammable, poisonous, and if they leach into the environment, can be ecotoxic.

Such batteries must not be disposed of in landfills unless they have been securely encased in concrete.

Other types of lithium batteries are classified as hazardous materials unless they have been certified as fully discharged prior to disposal. These hazards are related to the production of flammable gases from batteries that have not been discharged.

Lithium is not among the elements listed as hazardous in international instruments such as the Basel Convention on hazardous wastes.

(2) Statutory responsibility pertaining to the disposal of used batteries in each of the States and Territories rests with the environment protection agencies in those jurisdictions. As a result my department has no information on what camera shops do with their used batteries.

(3) (a) Through my department the Commonwealth Government is responsible for the implementation and administration of the Hazardous Waste (Regulation of Exports and Imports) Act 1989 (the Act). The Act was developed to enable Australia to comply with specific obligations under the United Nations Basel Convention on the Control of the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Basel Convention).

The main purpose of the Act is to regulate the export and import of hazardous waste to ensure that hazardous waste is disposed of safely so that human beings and the environment, both within and outside Australia are protected from the harmful effects of waste. The Act does not regulate movements of hazardous waste within Australia.

The Commonwealth Government is not responsible for the transport and storage of lithium batteries within Australia.

(b) With respect to recycling programs for lithium batteries, the Commonwealth does not have any existing programs.

The only recycling program involving lithium batteries of which my Department is aware, is the Mobile Phone Industry Recycling Program developed by the Australian Mobile Telecommunications Association.

(c) As explained earlier, used lithium batteries with liquid cathodes or lithium batteries that have not been certified as fully discharged, can not be transported into or out of Australia without a permit from my department.

In Australia, lithium batteries are disposed of under the control of Local, State and Territory Governments. Movements from one jurisdiction to another are not controlled under the National Environment Protection Measure for the movement of controlled waste between States and Territories, unless the batteries contain organic solvents.

New Apprenticeships Access Program: William Angliss Institute of Technical and Further Education

(Question No. 3831)

Senator Carr asked the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 8 August 2001:

(1) Has approximately $200 000 been provided in the past 2 years, under the New Apprenticeship Access Program, to the meat department of the William Angliss Institute of TAFE.

(2) What is the amount of federal funding involved in the recent unaccountable disappearance or inappropriate delivery of 4 tonnes of meat from the meat department at William Angliss to a meat wholesaler.

(3) What investigations are under way to identify the extent of this misappropriation and the degree to which Commonwealth programs have been either affected or involved.
(4) What contact has been initiated with any Victorian agency to investigate the extent of this misappropriation and the degree to which federal resources have been involved.

(5) What steps are being taken by the Commonwealth to recover federal funds involved in this misappropriation.

Senator Ellison—The Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) No. William Angliss Institute of TAFE has received $41,400 under the New Apprenticeships Access Programme (NAAP) for the provision of three training programmes for up to 45 participants. Funding under NAAP is paid for the number of commencements and completions achieved, as well as New Apprenticeships and full time employment outcomes. Training programmes conducted by the William Angliss Institute of TAFE provided NAAP participants with a Certificate in Meat Processing - Meat Retailing.

(2) Not applicable.

(3) Not applicable.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

Education: Australian Constitution

(Question No. 3836)

Senator Harris asked the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Training, and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 10 August 2001:

(1) Is it a fact that it is now impossible to obtain, from the Government printers, copies of the Australian Constitution.

(2) Is it a fact that the Government Printers have no plans to print any more Australian Constitution booklets; if so, why.

(3) Why is the Australian Constitution not taught in every Australian school.

(4) When will it become mandatory for every student in Australia to have, as a textbook, the Australian Constitution.

Senator Ellison—The Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) I have been advised by the Department of Finance and Administration and the Attorney-General’s Department that copies of the Constitution are still available through Government Info Shops in standard B5 format, as part of the Commonwealth’s legislation printing programme and that the smaller sized “pocket” Constitution is currently out of print, due to a larger than expected demand for the publication.

(2) I have been advised by the Australian Government Solicitor (AGS) and the Parliamentary Education Office (PEO) that a reprint of the smaller sized “pocket” Constitution is being arranged through the AGS and the PEO. The Constitution is currently available via the Internet on the Attorney-General’s Department Scaleplus website (http://scaleplus.law.gov.au/).

(3) The Government sees the study of the history and operation of Australia’s system of government and civic life as an important area of the school curriculum. This includes the study of the Australian Constitution.

States and Territories have primary responsibility for school education, including the development and implementation of education policy and curriculum. The Commonwealth plays a collaborative role in identifying and developing national priorities for schooling.

One of the National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century, endorsed by all Australian Education ministers in April 1999 is that students, when they leave school, should “be active and informed citizens with an understanding and appreciation of Australia’s system of government and civic life”. All Education ministers have also agreed to the development of student performance indicators for civics and citizenship education to measure student outcomes in these important areas.
The Government promotes civics and citizenship education through its Discovering Democracy programme, to which it has allocated $32 million over 7 years (1997-2004). The Discovering Democracy materials, delivered free to every school in the country, help students to understand the significance of the Australian Constitution. The materials help students to understand key concepts such as the rule of law, equality before the law, the independence of the judiciary, the independence of Australia’s legal system and the roles of constitutions, parliaments and courts in Australia. The customised CD-ROM One Destiny! The Federation Story – the Centenary Edition, distributed in May 2001, will be particularly helpful for students studying the Constitution.

In addition, an electronic resource is being developed for the Discovering Democracy website (http://www.curriculum.edu.au/democracy/) hosted by Curriculum Corporation, which will include the text of the Australian Constitution and the texts of other key documents such as the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. This resource will also include the full set of 18 Discovering Democracy learning units, originally distributed in print form. A number of these units include a focus on the Constitution.

As an associated activity of the Discovering Democracy programme, the Government also provides support for the study of the Constitution in Australian schools through support for the National Schools Constitutional Convention. It is planned to hold the 2002 National Schools Constitutional Convention in Canberra in March.

(4) Under the Constitution, States and Territories have primary responsibility for school education, including the development and implementation of education policy and curriculum. Policy on matters such as the mandatory or non-mandatory use of particular textbooks is a State and Territory responsibility.

Perera, Major General Janaka

(Senate Question No. 3837)

Senator Brown asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 13 August 2001:

With reference to the answer to the question on notice No. 3638 (Hansard, 7 August 2001, page 25750):

Was the Visak Day massacre in Batticaloa in May 2000 considered in any direct or indirect way in your assessment of High Commissioner Perera’s appointment and does the Government have any information on this event; if so:

(a) what was considered;

(b) was General Perera’s involvement or non-involvement established or implicated;

(c) what is the Government’s information on the event.

Senator Hill—The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(a) Careful consideration was given to the appointment and the Government received advice from a number of sources. As the process of granting agreement is confidential, I will not further detail the investigations that were undertaken other than to say that they were performed diligently.

(b) The answer to this question requires a detailed chronology of Major-General Perera’s commands, locations and movements. The responsibility for providing such information lies with the Sri Lankan authorities.

(c) Information available to the Government suggests that a bombing attack took place in May 2000 in the eastern town of Batticaloa resulting in the deaths of 23 civilians and injuring over 40. The bombing had all the hallmarks of an attack by the LTTE. Reports after this incident took place claimed that some of the injuries may have been caused by the security forces retaliating in the aftermath of the explosion.
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