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SITTING DAYS—2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>7, 8, 9, 27, 28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>9, 10, 11, 29, 30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RADIO BROADCASTS

Broadcasts of proceedings of the Parliament can be heard on ABC NewsRadio in the capital cities on:

- ADELAIDE 972AM
- BRISBANE 936AM
- CANBERRA 103.9FM
- DARWIN 102.5FM
- HOBART 747AM
- MELBOURNE 1026AM
- PERTH 585AM
- SYDNEY 630AM

For information regarding frequencies in other locations please visit
http://www.abc.net.au/newsradio/listen/frequencies.htm
FORTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION—SIXTH PERIOD

Governor-General
Her Excellency Ms Quentin Bryce, Companion of the Order of Australia

Senate Office holders
President—Senator Hon. John Joseph Hogg
Deputy President and Chair of Committees—Senator Stephen Shane Parry
Temporary Chairs of Committees—Senators Christopher John Back, Thomas Mark Bishop, Suzanne Kay Boyce, Douglas Niven Cameron, Patricia Margaret Crossin, David Julian Fawcett, Mary Jo Fisher, Mark Lionel Furner, Scott Ludlam, Gavin Mark Marshall, Claire Mary Moore, Louise Clare Pratt and Ursula Mary Stephens
Leader of the Government in the Senate—Senator Hon. Christopher Vaughan Evans
Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate—Senator Hon. Stephen Michael Conroy
Leader of the Opposition in the Senate—Senator Hon. Eric Abetz
Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Senate—Senator Hon. George Henry Brandis SC
Manager of Government Business in the Senate—Senator Hon. Joseph William Ludwig
Manager of Opposition Business in the Senate—Senator Mitchell Peter Fifield

Senate Party Leaders and Whips
Leader of the Australian Labor Party—Senator Hon. Christopher Vaughan Evans
Deputy Leader of the Australian Labor Party—Senator Hon. Stephen Michael Conroy
Leader of the Liberal Party of Australia—Senator Hon. Eric Abetz
Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party of Australia—Senator Hon. George Henry Brandis SC
Leader of The Nationals—Senator Barnaby Thomas Gerard Joyce
Deputy Leader of The Nationals—Senator Fiona Nash
Leader of the Australian Greens—Senator Christine Anne Milne
Chief Government Whip—Senator Anne McEwen
Deputy Government Whips—Senators Carol Louise Brown and Helen Beatrice Polley
Chief Opposition Whip—Senator Helen Kroger
Deputy Opposition Whips—Senators Judith Anne Adams and David Christopher Bushby
The Nationals Whip—Senator John Reginald Williams
Australian Greens Whip—Senator Rachel Mary Siewert

Printed by authority of the Senate
Members of the Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>State or Territory</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abetz, Hon. Eric</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back, Christopher John</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardi, Cory</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilyk, Catryna Louise</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, Simon John</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Thomas Mark</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boswell, Hon. Ronald Leslie Doyle</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce, Suzanne Kay</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandis, Hon. George Henry, SC</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Carol Louise</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Robert James</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushby, David Christopher</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, Douglas Niven</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Hon. Kim John</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Hon. Robert John (3)</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Michaelia Clare</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbeck, Hon. Richard Mansell</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Jacinta Mary Ann</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conroy, Hon. Stephen Michael</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cormann, Mathias Hubert Paul</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossin, Patricia Margaret (1)</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Natale, Richard</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Sean</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggleston, Alan</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Hon. Christopher Vaughan</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell, Donald Edward</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulkner, Hon. John Philip</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawcett, David Julian</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeney, David Ian</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fierravanti-Wells, Concetta Anna</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifield, Mitchell Peter</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Mary Jo</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furner, Mark Lionel</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, Alexander McEachian</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson-Young, Sarah Coral</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heffernan, Hon. William Daniel</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogg, Hon. John Joseph</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphries, Gary John Joseph (1)</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, Hon. David Albert Lloyd</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce, Barnaby Thomas Gerard</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroger, Helen</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlam, Scott</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lundy, Kate Alexandra (1)</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonald, Hon. Ian Douglas</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madigan, John Joseph</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>DLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEwen, Anne</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie, Bridget</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLucas, Hon. Jan Elizabeth</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>State or Territory</td>
<td>Term expires</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, Gavin Mark</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason, Hon. Brett John</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milne, Christine Anne</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Claire Mary</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash, Fiona Joy</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry, Stephen Shane</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne, Marise Ann</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polley, Helen Beatrice</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt, Louise Clare</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhiannon, Lee</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronaldson, Hon. Michael</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, Scott Michael</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scullion, Hon. Nigel Gregory (1)</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry, Hon. Nicholas John</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siewert, Rachel Mary</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh, Hon. Lisa Maria</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinodinos, Arthur (2)</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Dean Anthony (4)</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens, Hon. Ursula Mary</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterle, Glenn</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistlethwaite, Matthew</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urquhart, Anne Elizabeth</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters, Larissa Joy</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, John Reginald</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Penelope Lesley</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Hon. Penelope Ying Yen</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon, Nicholas</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Term expires at close of day next preceding the polling day for the general election of members of the House of Representatives.

(2) Chosen by the Parliament of New South Wales to fill a casual vacancy (vice H. Coonan, resigned 22.8.11), pursuant to section 15 of the Constitution.

(3) Chosen by the Parliament of New South Wales to fill a casual vacancy (vice Hon. M. Arbib, resigned 5.3.12), pursuant to section 15 of the Constitution.

(4) Chosen by the Parliament of Western Australia to fill a casual vacancy (vice J. Adams, died in office 31.3.12), pursuant to section 15 of the Constitution.

**PARTY ABBREVIATIONS**


**Heads of Parliamentary Departments**

Clerk of the Senate—R Laing
Clerk of the House of Representatives—B Wright
Acting Secretary, Department of Parliamentary Services—R Grove
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Minister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prime Minister</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Julia Gillard MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity</em></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Stephen Conroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Social Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Mark Butler MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for the Public Service and Integrity</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Gary Gray AO MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Mental Health Reform</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Mark Butler MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on the Centenary of ANZAC</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cabinet Secretary</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Jan McLucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Wayne Swan MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Deputy Prime Minister)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Financial Services and Superannuation</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Bill Shorten MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Treasurer</strong></td>
<td>The Hon David Bradbury MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Bernie Ripoll MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills, Science and Research</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Chris Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Leader of the Government in the Senate)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Industry and Innovation</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Greg Combet AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Small Business</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Brendan O'Connor MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister Assisting for Industry and Innovation</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Kate Lundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parliamentary Secretary for Industry and Innovation</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parliamentary Secretary for Higher Education and Skills</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Sharon Bird MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Stephen Conroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Regional Australia, Regional Development and Local</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Simon Crean MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for the Arts</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Simon Crean MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Sport</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Kate Lundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Defence</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Stephen Smith MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Deputy Leader of the House)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Defence Materiel</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Jason Clare MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Veterans’ Affairs</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Defence Science and Personnel</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parliamentary Secretary for Defence</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Dr Mike Kelly AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parliamentary Secretary for Defence</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon David Feeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Immigration and Citizenship</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Chris Bowen MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Multicultural Affairs</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Kate Lundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Infrastructure and Transport</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Anthony Albanese MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Leader of the House)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Transport</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Catherine King MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney-General</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Nicola Roxon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Emergency Management</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Nicola Roxon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister Assisting on Queensland Floods Recovery</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Joe Ludwig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Home Affairs</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Jason Clare MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minister for Justice</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Jason Clare MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs</td>
<td>The Hon Jenny Macklin MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Disability Reform</td>
<td>The Hon Jenny Macklin MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Housing</td>
<td>The Hon Brendan O'Connor MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Homelessness</td>
<td>The Hon Brendan O'Connor MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Community Services</td>
<td>The Hon Julie Collins MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for the Status of Women</td>
<td>The Hon Julie Collins MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Jan McLucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Bob Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Trade</td>
<td>The Hon Dr Craig Emerson MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Pacific Island Affairs</td>
<td>The Hon Justine Elliot MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>The Hon Richard Marles MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and</td>
<td>The Hon Tony Burke MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities (Vice-President of the Executive Council)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Sustainability and Urban Water</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Don Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Finance and Deregulation</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Penny Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Minister of State</td>
<td>The Hon Gary Gray AO MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting for Deregulation</td>
<td>The Hon David Bradbury MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for School Education, Early Childhood and Youth</td>
<td>The Hon Peter Garrett AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations (Manager of</td>
<td>The Hon Bill Shorten MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Business in the Senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for School Education and Workplace Relations</td>
<td>The Hon Kate Ellis MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Indigenous Employment and Economic Development</td>
<td>The Hon Kate Ellis MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Jacinta Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Vice-President of</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Joe Ludwig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Business in the Senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry</td>
<td>The Hon Sid Sidebottom MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Resources and Energy</td>
<td>The Hon Martin Ferguson AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Tourism</td>
<td>The Hon Martin Ferguson AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>The Hon Greg Combet AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Health</td>
<td>The Hon Tanya Plibersek MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Mental Health and Ageing</td>
<td>The Hon Mark Butler MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Indigenous Health</td>
<td>The Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
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Tuesday, 8 May 2012

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. John Hogg) took the chair at 12:30, read prayers and made an acknowledgement of country.

CONDOLENCES
Adams, Senator Judith Anne Bowen, Hon. Lionel Frost, AC

The PRESIDENT (12:31): It is with deep regret that I inform honourable senators of the death on 31 March 2012 of Senator Judith Anne Adams, who served Australia and Western Australia with distinction in this place from 2005.

I understand it is the wish of the Senate that today it deal only with the swearing in of Senator Smith, followed by condolence motions for Senator Adams and former member of the House of Representatives Lionel Bowen.

PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION
Western Australia

The PRESIDENT (12:32): As a result of the death of Senator Judith Adams and pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Constitution, the Governor of Western Australia was notified of the vacancy in the representation of that state. I table a copy of the letter to the Governor of Western Australia.

I have received, through the Governor-General, from the Governor of Western Australia, a certificate of the choice by the parliament of Western Australia of Mr Dean Anthony Smith to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Judith Adams. I table the document.

Senators Sworn
Senator Dean Anthony Smith made and subscribed the oath of allegiance.

CONDOLENCES
Adams, Senator Judith Anne

Senator ABETZ (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition in the Senate) (12:37): by leave—I move:

That the Senate records its deep regret at the death, on 31 March 2012, of Senator Judith Anne Adams, Senator for Western Australia, places on record its appreciation of her long and meritorious public service and tenders its profound sympathy to her family in their bereavement.

'I am looking forward to getting on with the job of strengthening Australia.' With those words Senator Judith Adams concluded her first speech in this place. It was a speech which gave a wonderful insight into what would be an all too short but nevertheless by any measure a very full period of service as a senator. She got on with the job, and she did help to strengthen our great nation, Australia. We in the coalition lost a true friend on 31 March 2012. At the thanksgiving service for Judith Anne Adams it became obvious that her local community of Kojonup had also lost a great friend and community leader as well, and two sons had lost a loving mother. The service, so ably led by the Reverend Lindy Rookyard, heard many a moving anecdote, especially from her two sons, of whom she can be extremely proud. We heard of a life well lived, dedicated to the service of others. As an aside, it was good to see and hear Wilson Tuckey, the former member for O'Connor, actually sticking to a script and being reduced to tears. When a bloke like Wilson Tuckey is reduced to tears, you know you have been part of a very deep and moving occasion. And so it was, because everyone felt the loss of Judith as a personal loss.

For us in the Liberal Party, we lost a respected friend and colleague—our senior Deputy Opposition Whip. The presence at
her memorial service from across all the parties was a wonderful tribute, as is the very kind courtesy extended to me this afternoon by the Leader of the Government in the Senate by allowing me on behalf of the coalition to move this condolence motion. I know that Senator Judith Adams would have been most grateful for that, and we on this side of the chamber, Senator Evans, are very grateful. We Liberals lost a committed worker, be it in committee work or be it door-knocking—especially in the seat of Hasluck. She was one of those senators who was able to debunk the stereotype that senators have no idea who constituents are and that senators have no idea what grassroots politics is all about. She was the exemplar of grassroots politics in the Liberal Party. Marginal seat members in the other place, from both sides of politics, could take a great big chunk out of Senator Adams's book about looking after the grassroots areas of their electorates. So, be it door-knocking or be it attending functions, Senator Adams was there, getting on with the job that she dedicated herself to in that first speech.

Our senior deputy whip had those endearing qualities of a lady brought up on a farm, who worked the farm and had a career in nursing in both the military and country areas—qualities of determination; a no-nonsense attitude tempered with a genuine loving soul. Her no-nonsense approach, chances are, would have her protesting that it is a waste of good opposition time today not to have question time and not to hold the government to account. I think she would have preferred the Senate to undertake its normal business. But I also know that Senator Adams, watching on as I am sure she is, will appreciate this token by the chamber, by all senators, to adjourn later on this afternoon in appreciation and recognition of her great work as a senator.

Senator Adams had a work ethic second to none. She was unassuming yet absolutely forceful. The feminine and finer things of life were part of Senator Adams's make-up too. When we go to the senior deputy whip's office now, there are not the wonderful floral displays that always welcomed you. Can I thank our Chief Opposition Whip for organising the sheaf of flowers that rests on Senator Adams's desk as a tribute to our colleague. I think Senator Bushby will have something to live up to in relation to the flower arrangement side of things in the whip's office.

Senator Adams's policy interests were broad and varied. Her maiden speech bears testimony to that. Her work bears testimony to the fact that she was actively engaged in following through, or getting on with the job. Her support for the military, both through her rich family history—having lost her grandfather, a New Zealander but a member of the ANZAC forces at Gallipoli—and through her public policy pursuits, was there for all to see. The presence of our military at the thanksgiving service, for the ode and the last post, was something that Senator Adams would have truly appreciated and treasured.

The last time I personally saw the good senator was shortly before Christmas, while attending a business roundtable that she had organised. She conducted the forum as though all was well. It was only afterwards that she sort of confided that she was in some discomfort. Her tenacity and stoicism would put a lot of us blokes to shame. Her obvious pain, even before the parliament rose, was dismissed by her as some passing ailment that would soon be overcome. When I spoke with her this year she was apologetic about the need to seek a pair. She spoke of the nuisance value of her ailments, all of which she was sure she would overcome. While in hospital, she followed question time, and she regretted not being able to fully follow
estimates in February. Such was her dedication to duty as a senator. If we should be afflicted as our dear friend was, may we be able to show the same grace, patience and determination as displayed by Senator Adams. Her loves were there for all to see: the Liberal Party; meeting people; doorknocking; committee work, especially in the Senate Standing Committees on Community Affairs; the rural and regional areas of Australia; and her beloved state of Western Australia—but, above all else, her family.

The Bible reading chosen by the Reverend Rookyard as the basis for her homily on the occasion of the memorial service was taken from Ecclesiastes chapter 3. Part of that scripture read, in verses 12 and 13:

I know that there is nothing better for men than to be happy and do good while they live. That everyone may eat and drink, and find satisfaction in all his toil—this is the gift of God.

Senator Adams was richly blessed. She was happy, she did good while she lived and she found satisfaction in all his toil—this is the gift of God.

Honourable senators: Hear, hear!

Senator CHRIS EVANS (Western Australia—Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills, Science and Research and Leader of the Government in the Senate) (12:46): I rise on behalf of the government to support the motion moved by Senator Abetz expressing our deep regret at the death of Senator Judith Adams. I think this is quite a different occasion for us in the sense that normally, when we deal with condolence motions, we deal with people who have long since left the chamber and often are unknown to us. This is a much more personal experience, I know, for all senators. In my time here, I think we have only done it twice before. Once was for the late Senator John Panizza and once was for Senator Jeannie Ferris. I might point out that all were whips of the Liberal Party at the time of their death. All three were well-regarded personalities and strong contributors to the Senate.

The first thing to say about Judith is that, for the outside world, she was probably not one of the better known senators. That was because she dedicated herself to the more important work of the Senate—her role on committees, her role in representing the community and her activism in the community. She was not one for the one-liners at the doors, which is how a senator normally gets noticed—either favourably or unfavourably depending on whether they nail the line. Judith was one of those people who saw the opportunity of working in the Senate as a great privilege. Every day she showed her respect for that privilege and seized the opportunities that came with the job. She was tremendously proud and grateful for the opportunities and resolved to make every day one where she contributed.

She was a great advocate for rural and regional Western Australia and, as Senator Abetz said, had great passions—probably driven by her nursing background and her service in the New Zealand territorial army as a nurse. She had a tremendous passion for health issues and for the health of rural and regional Australians and Indigenous Australians. She had done a lot of work in the community in the years leading up to her election as senator.

She also had a huge interest in defence matters and in the welfare of Australian serving personnel. I used to tease her that she fancied men in uniform and that that was the reason for her strong interest in defence activities—which she never really denied,
but she said there were other motivators as well!

Senator Abetz rightly pointed to her work as a campaigner for the Liberal Party in elections. She did put many senators to shame with her commitment to marginal seat campaigning. I used to support my very good friend Sharryn Jackson in the seat of Hasluck, both as a candidate and as member. Judith campaigned for Stuart Henry. I remember it was a really difficult time for us—Sharryn's family had lived in Kojonup and her parents spoke very warmly of Judith. Sharryn had to deal with Judith putting out material against her every week and then her family talking lovingly about Judith at dinner, saying what a great community worker she was. Things were further complicated by the fact that Stuart Henry and I were old rugby mates—I had a real soft spot for Stuart. So it was a very difficult campaign in many ways. Sharryn won that one and then, thanks in no small part to Judith's efforts, the Liberal Party won the seat at the next election.

I think we all know that Judith came to the parliament as a breast cancer survivor. She had a really long battle with her health. You would not have known it, unless you knew her personally, because of her stoicism and her absolute drive to continue to do the job to her full capacity. She also dealt with personal tragedy during that time—the loss of her husband—so she had a really tough period. But, as I say, she got up every day and worked and worked and worked. Nothing was too much trouble. I remember speaking to her a number of times, encouraging her, as many others did, to slow down, not to feel she had to go to the committee hearing in Katherine or wherever with her partners in crime from our side and the Greens. She would just not accept at all that she ought to slow down. Even when she was having tremendous difficulty getting on and off planes, and senators from all sides were helping with her bags et cetera, she insisted on continuing to do her job. That commitment was an inspiration. When I visited her in hospital earlier in the year, her only focus, her only conversation, was about when she could get back, how she could get back and how frustrated she was at not being able to contribute. I did advise her to stop watching Senate question time. I could not possibly understand why she tortured herself with that while in a hospital bed, but she insisted. She followed it very closely and even chipped me about one of my answers while I was visiting her.

But I think that reflected, as I say, her commitment to and her friendships across the parliament. I think the funeral really indicated that. We not only had Liberal and National senators and members there, we had Labor senators and former senators, we had Greens senators and, though people may not remember, we had a couple of Democrats senators as well, which I think reflected the strength of her relationships across the parliament. I, like Senator Abetz, was struck by Wilson Tuckey displaying another side of his personality and character; it was a remarkable event. But he made a tremendous speech. There were also very fine contributions by her sons Stuart and Robert, who are very impressive young men and told amusing and instructive anecdotes about their mother. The turnout from the local community was a sign of her enormous support and of the community work she had done over many years.

So I, on behalf of all government senators, express our condolences to her family and friends. She is a loss to the parliament and a great loss to the Liberal Party in Western Australia. We do acknowledge her absolute dedication and commitment, and I think it can be said of her that she absolutely seized on and respected the opportunities of being a
senator and gave the electors much more than they could have expected. So, on behalf of the government, I extend our condolences to Judith's family.

Senator JOYCE (Queensland—Leader of The Nationals in the Senate) (12:53): I rise to concur with the remarks made by Senator Abetz and Senator Evans. Everybody is saying the same thing: we are talking about a lady of tenacity, a lady of stoicism, and a person of commitment; a person who apologised for her infirmities, as awkward as that made us feel, rather than make excuses by reason of her infirmities.

The public may not have known who Judith Adams was, but we certainly did. She was a person who showed that a commitment to the nation can be given at any time in your life. She joined the Senate at the same time as me and many others here. She was 62. I remember that at the time I was 38. She was a person who did not make age a barrier. She wanted to make sure that her contribution to her nation would be unambiguous, consistent and all the way through.

She showed that you could have a commitment coming from any area—she came from regional Western Australia, though born in Picton in the northern part of the South Island of New Zealand. She grew up with an affinity for and knowing what it was like to be a part of a regional area, as she was both here and in New Zealand. She showed that a person could come from any background and have a commitment to this nation. She was a person with a heritage—a heritage that linked so closely to ours, her grandfather having been missing in action at Chunuk Bair in, I think, August 1915.

This was a person who had many facets to her character, but I think the thing that resonates with so many people is what she represented. She represented the person who was quietly suffering in silence but working diligently and hard—even while going around, in many instances, in that little electric wheelchair. She was a person who really jerked us back into gear. We think about the small problems we have, and yet here was a person who obviously knew that her time was coming but did not show it; she just kept working on.

She was a person who had a commitment to her fellow man—I am sure she was never politically correct; 'fellow man', 'fellow person', whatever you like—and in 1967 she was part of the Colombo Plan as a nurse in South Vietnam. She also, later on, joined the New Zealand territorial army. That showed a passion, a patriotism and a commitment to her fellow man that resonated throughout her life.

As to her role in this Senate, I know how proud she was when she started. That was just another manifestation of an exemplary character. I found her, and I am sure that many other people found her, to be a person who was strong. If you asked, 'What is a word you could associate with Judith Adams?' it would be 'strength'. She was a person of strength. She was resolute. And there was that item that has been spoken about so often this afternoon—no fuss. She just hated people fussing over things. She wanted you to get to the point and get going or get out of her life and go away! But I think all of us feel it was a great honour to know Judith.

She also did much work with ovarian cancer and breast cancer; she had major roles to play with those. She did these things congruent with her life in politics. She did not just say, 'My life in politics is the be-all and end-all.' There were other facets that she would participate in on the way through.

I did not manage to go to her funeral; I had other parliamentary business. Fiona went, and I thank Fiona for that, though
Fiona would have gone in any case. But it was a privilege to go to the funeral of her husband, Gordon, and to be with her at that point in her life. Once more, what shone through was a person dealing with the implications of the funeral and the organisation of the family. Most of us, at the loss of a partner, would be overwhelmed by grief; it was not that she did not feel the grief, but that she controlled it because she had a job to do. These are other instances of a person of great character.

She is survived by Stuart and Robert, and we see how they reflect their mother, their mum. I know our thoughts and prayers go out to Stuart and Robert. At least they will have the knowledge that their mother was a great person. She was great because her colleagues—who are the best people to judge you—the people in this chamber, saw her as a great person, saw her as a strong person.

She was absolutely partisan and passionate about Western Australia—sometimes, much to the grief of myself and others. On the loss of the single desk: she supported their views; she went in to fight for the views of her people. Likewise, she was a passionate member of the Liberal Party. And we respected that. Every person respects the person who puts the views of their party and the communal job above their own desires and follows that course. With Judith, there was no doubt about it; we knew which party she was in, and she pursued that course without diversion, and without diversion for her own personal goals. She did not have a personal goal; she had a party goal, and she pursued that. She was an enthusiastic supporter of the Australia's defence forces. These were all her mannerisms and why I think it is a great honour for us to have known and served with Judith Adams and to be a small part of a great person's life. I did not go to the funeral but I did write an op-ed for Judith in the Canberra Times. I will close with my final paragraph from that op-ed:

My recollection of Judith will be her intense interest in the lives of regional Australians. She committed to the task knowing she was never going to be a senior office holder. The reality is that many of the wider public would probably not even know her name. The strength about Judith was that this was not what was driving her.

She just wanted people to have their lives affected in a way which made things better for them. She didn't want the fuss and the bother of the laurels. Even when she was going around on her electric wheelchair in Parliament, she always said that this was only temporary and that she was getting better. I have a sneaking suspicion she realised the truth but just didn't want the attention to distract her from her job for others.

Rest in peace, Judith.

Senator SIEWERT (Western Australia—Australian Greens Whip) (13:01): I join with the rest of the Senate in wholeheartedly supporting this condolence motion. I thank my colleagues for allowing me to lead for the Greens in this condolence motion because, out of all of us, I knew Judith the best, both being proud Western Australians. Senator Milne and I came in in the same intake of senators as Judith. I could not calculate the number of hours that I spent with Senator Adams in hearings of the community affairs committee and the rural and regional affairs committee. It is fair to say that many people outside this place do not realise how much cross-party work we do and how much time we spend travelling together on planes, cars and buses, and eating when we are doing committee work. All of those things I shared with Judith.
I had the privilege of attending her funeral service at the Kojonup Memorial Hall. About a decade previous to her service I attended a marriage celebration at the same hall. I am pleased to be able to say that her service was a celebration of Judith's life. I knew a lot about Judith but one of the things many of us learned was that, as a young woman, she also undertook fencing. There was a dramatic photo of Judith fencing and it did remind me of how good Judith was at fencing—verbally was my experience with Judith.

When Judith made her first speech here, she articulated how pleased she was to be here but also that she was, as Senator Joyce just said, over 60 years of age. She shared the point about the need to value experience and for experienced people to mentor younger people in all walks of life. She also talked about a range of issues she was passionate about which she took up in this place. Many of those issues I shared with her and was equally passionate about, so we worked very often across parties. I will go into some of those in a moment.

I want to touch on how strongly committed, dedicated and strong willed Senator Adams was. Her capacity to work was renowned. Her inability to give up was renowned. Her ability to keep working in the face of adversity was, again, renowned. I remember the day that her husband, Gordon, passed away. She was supposed to be attending a community affairs committee hearing. The way that she handled that overwhelming loss was remarkable. They were moving to their new home on that day. For those who do not know, the family had sold their farm in Kojonup, had lived in Perth for a short while and had found a beautiful home in Gidgegannup, just north of Perth. The day that Gordon died was the day that they were moving into their new home. Judith handled that with aplomb. We all sent flowers, and I remember just a couple of days later Judith ringing and talking to me, saying thank you and talking about what had happened. I thought what a brave person she was to be phoning and responding and saying thank you so close to the tragedy of Gordon's passing.

As many people know, Judith had this illness for a while, but people outside would not have known. I have travelled on committee hearings with Judith when she was ill, out of public sight, in 'the ladies', and when she came out nobody would have known that she had just been feeling very unwell. Not one member of the public or any person in that hearing would have known. That was her strength: she kept on going and she was focused on the issues. When she was not able to join us—and I know that Senator Moore will be able to confirm this—she was making sure she was sending through questions and making sure we were following up the right issues. She was very fierce when she was cross. I remember one time when we were having hearings in Central Australia, in Alice Springs. We usually stay in the same hotels and one of my colleagues had said something in the media that Judith was very angry about. We were having breakfast and she stomped into the dining room and told me off. It was about the Army, by the way, and I agree with Senator Evans. I have also joked with Senator Adams about her support for men in uniform, and we shared the joke several times.

I would like to quickly touch on some of the issues I am aware of that Judith so proudly worked on in this place. Her passion and support for rural Australia was well known. She consistently took that up everywhere and she particularly focused a lot on rural health and Aboriginal health. At some stages when we were developing recommendations for the community affairs committee I think there was a bit of a
competition as to who could suggest the toughest recommendations.

Wilson Tuckey gave the eulogy, and I join Senator Evans and Senator Abetz in saying that I was deeply touched by Wilson’s eulogy. I thought it was beautiful and that he did a fantastic job. He did break down at the beginning but I thought he did a beautiful job. In his speech he touched on Judith’s support for getting rid of the single desk and how that was not shared by some of her colleagues on the same side of the chamber. That is one thing that she and I also had in common. She also worked on the Opal fuel issue and was passionate in her support for it. I just remind senators that she was very supportive of the mandatory rollout of Opal fuel. In fact, one of the last conversations we had in this place was about needing to do something about the mandatory rollout of Opal fuel.

As we know, Judith also worked on breast cancer and bowel cancer. I remember her and me leading a rally around Perth’s central business district yelling out, ‘Get behind bowel cancer!’ because at the time we thought that was a really good slogan. She did a lot of work on the community affairs committee on bowel cancer as well as breast cancer. She was passionate in this place in RU486 and stem cell debates and was passionate about regional health as well. She was a fearsome advocate for the issues that she cared very deeply about. She was an extremely compassionate person on those issues. As an aside, most people I think will be aware that she was very passionate about horses and racing. However, again it was not until the service celebrating her life that just how much she was involved in the racing scene came out. What she did not know about horses was not worth knowing. She combined those passions with her other civic duty work. She was a JP in Kojonup and I do not think there is a single person in Kojonup who did not know Judith. Not to prove that WA is so inbred, but I have very close family friends also in Kojonup who know Judith’s family and it was the same situation: you could be very passionate about issues but when it came down to family and personal staff that was a whole other area of life that you did not cross over into in terms of getting those political arguments going.

Judith will be sorely missed in this place and sorely missed on the community affairs committee. Until very recently, she never missed estimates or a community affairs hearing. You could always rely on Judith being there. As Wilson Tuckey also said, she would go to Senate committee hearings from across the country if she was needed and if somebody else could not make it. You could always rely on Judith to come and participate and ask hard questions. I suspect FaHCSIA and DoHA will be breathing just a little bit easier on certain issues because they know Senator Adams will not be there to ask them some hard questions. Senator Smith, I do not think you will be up to speed enough to be able to ask those piercing questions in estimates this time around.

I would like to join in offering our deep condolences on Judith’s passing to her family, to Stuart and Robbie and to Judith’s granddaughters, whom I know she was very proud of. She travelled to Canada to spend time with them. She was thrilled at the birth of her granddaughters, and I was so happy that she was able to spend some time with them. At a personal level, I will miss working with Judith on so many of the issues that we shared and were passionate about. I will miss her presence in this chamber and her presence as deputy whip. She has left an indelible mark on this place and on the issues that she worked on. I will finish by giving my support to this condolence motion and wishing her family all the best.
Senator BRANDIS (Queensland—Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Senate) (13:11): Judith Adams began her parliamentary career unusually late in life. She was already in her 60s at the time she was preselected by the Western Australia division of the Liberal Party for the No. 3 spot on the 2004 Senate ticket, replacing our former colleague Senator Sue Knowles. She was elected and became a member of this place on 1 July 2005, so she was among us for only six years and nine months until her death on 31 March at what is these days the relatively early age of 68. But she made a very strong impression on everyone. One only has to hear the tributes paid across the chamber today to appreciate what a strong impression Judith Adams made.

I remember one of her first coalition party room meetings, which Senator Joyce has already adverted to. There was a lot of tension at the time between the Liberal Party and the National Party on the issue of wheat marketing and Senator Adams, representing the views of Western Australian wheat producers, was a fierce opponent of the single-desk selling system, which the National Party strongly supported. The then Prime Minister, John Howard, struggled manfully to reach a compromise position with the National Party on this very acute and difficult issue. Judith Adams arrived in the party room and she was not satisfied with the approach the Liberal Party was proposing to take. Unusually for a new backbencher, she rose and let John Howard know exactly what she thought, and it was very clear to all of us who were at that meeting that he had a very formidable person on his hands. In fact, I think he might even have been a little bit scared of her. They were not very far apart in age at the time and she certainly had his measure. The usual baubles that are hung before junior backbenchers were of absolutely no use in trying to propitiate the very strong views held by Senator Judith Adams, and she shifted the debate in a material way towards the outcome that she wanted. That is the first impression I had of Judith Adams—that she was a very determined and fearless person. But of course she was, at the same time, a perfect lady. She was a gentle person, quietly spoken, but very, very strong in her beliefs.

She was a wonderful advocate for regional Australia, particularly for regional Western Australia. She was obviously one of the great pillars of her local community. We have all seen, when we travel in the regional parts of our different states, how in small country towns or centres there is one formidable person, usually a formidable lady, who is the chair of almost every community organisation and really makes that community run. Well, in Kojonup, in the wheat belt of Western Australia, that was Judith Adams—and I gather it had been for many years.

She brought great life experience to this place, too—a function of the fact that she already had a long life behind her when she arrived. She had seen service in Vietnam as a military nurse and then she had a long and successful career in the pastoral industry. She had so many very fine human qualities. I have mentioned her strength and determination, as have other senators. She had great integrity. You could always trust Judith Adams. And she was, as has already been observed, very, very reliable—if you asked her to do something, it would always be done. She was very diligent in her committee work.

Obviously, Judith Adams had aspired to a parliamentary career for a very long time. When she was elected to the Senate it was not her first attempt to get into parliament. But I do think that the Senate was the right place for her. I think a forceful but quietly spoken person has a better chance of being
heard in the Senate, and in particular in working through the committee system, than in the House of Representatives. And it was her work in the committee system, particularly on regional and rural affairs, that distinguished her.

She was the soul of courtesy. She was, as Senator Abetz has mentioned, the senior Deputy Opposition Whip for some years—and it was an office she discharged impeccably. Yet, throughout the six years and nine months that we had her among us, she struggled with adversity. She was, as others have mentioned, already a cancer survivor at the time she was elected to the Senate, and her illness came back and ultimately, sadly, claimed her. So she had to deal with that. She also had to deal with the death of her husband, Gordon. And yet there was never a moment when I ever saw Judith Adams seeming to feel sorry for herself. Her attitude was to get through life's adversities, get on and get the job done.

That same attitude of courage in the face of adversity was evident right up to her very last days. She did not come to the Senate after the end of last year, because she was being treated in the terminal stages of her illness. Like most of my colleagues, I gather, I rang her up from time to time at the Royal Perth Hospital, and she was always cheerful, always determined to get back. As Senator Evans has mentioned, she was a compulsive viewer of question time—and an expert assessor and critic of the quality of some of the performances in question time, though never in a malicious way, because she was a generous person.

I will miss her. It is, I think, one of the great features of this institution, which, from our own different philosophical perspectives we all value and treasure, that a person like Judith Adams, in a relatively brief political career—one that spanned, for all practical purposes, little more than six years—can have made such an impact through her work here, although she was not on the front bench, through the assiduousness, conscientiousness and sheer industry of her committee work. She engendered respect among her colleagues of all political persuasions.

So might I join with my leader, Senator Abetz, and other senators, in expressing my condolences to her family—to her sons Stuart and Robbie, to her grandchildren and to the other members of her family—and my gratitude to have known such a good and gracious person.

Senator PARRY (Tasmania—Deputy President of the Senate and Chairman of Committees) (13:20): I, too, join in the condolence motion and endorse the comments of all senators who have spoken before me. I do not intend to go over the biographical details of Judith's life but maybe I will give some insights into my close relationship as chief whip to a very loyal and exceptional-working deputy whip.

When we joined together in 2004, as a number in this chamber did, we got to know each other from the Senate training school days and then the variety of activities you undertake with each other as senators. Our relationship was really cemented when we moved into opposition—I was elected as Chief Opposition Whip and Judith as my deputy. For those who do not know, and who are listening to the broadcast, the unique position of the whips' offices in this building—I still don't know why—is such that you share the same kitchen and you have conjoined offices, so you tend to spend a lot of time in each other's company. Equally, you walk in and out of the same meetings together at various times every day and you pop into each other's offices from time to time. So Judith and I got to know each other
on that basis, and she became a great confidante—an exceptional, loyal deputy. I had trouble getting her out of the chamber to go home when she was in pain at times, in her latter days. Judith was just a tremendous person to work with.

She had a reasonable sense of humour—I tested that one day. She was on her Gopher, heading to the party room meeting one Tuesday morning. She was leaving her office, and I cut across the courtyard. Judith went up the corridor on her Gopher, past the Prime Minister's office to the party room—and she actually beat me. I suppose she had people opening doors for her whereas I did not. When I got back I said, 'Judith, you have been clocked doing 22 kilometres per hour past the Prime Minister's office.' She was horrified to think there was a speed camera in that corridor! She took it seriously for a short while. To follow it up, a few days later, on a Thursday morning, she had parked the Gopher in what I would call a precarious position outside the opposition lobby. A lot of senators were coming in and out of the opposition lobby at the time having to move around the Gopher, so I stuck an infringement notice on it for irregular parking. Judith loved that.

Regarding the comments about her illness, she shared a little bit about her illness, but she was very stoic and private about it on most occasions. She was very private about her hair loss after the last bout of treatment, when she wore the wig, as everyone will recall. When she removed the wig and had that very short haircut—apart from the fact that she had more hair than me—she looked quite smart. She dressed up very nicely in a beautiful blue gown—and don't ask me whether it had sequins and all of those things—one evening when the Queen was here. We were leaving our offices together, and Judith looked absolutely magnificent. I said to her, 'You look like Dame Judi Dench,' and she did. If you took a quick glance at Judith when dressed up in her beautiful elegance, with her poise and demeanour, she looked like Dame Judith, so we called her Dame Judith for quite some time thereafter. She really enjoyed that. I think it tickled her.

Judith bought to the office a willing determination to get things done. If we were bogged down in different issues, from time to time Judith would use the persuasive power of her being (a) a mature female and (b) very forceful. She would say, 'You are speaking now and that is that.' It was quite good when Judith did that every now and then.

I agree with your comments, Senator Siewert, about her stubbornness and forcefulness with issues, because I can remember many occasions on which she had been to a breakfast meeting with you and then come back and said, 'That Rachel Siewert!' It was very good. She had a very healthy respect for you, both when you were working in adversity to each other and when you worked together on things, as she did for her colleagues in the Labor Party.

I miss her dearly and I think we all will, for a variety of reasons. I miss her for the close cohabitation we had in our offices—just being able to talk to her and pop in and see her. I went to see her in hospital earlier this year—I was there the day after Senator Evans called in. She was thrilled to pieces that he and others had taken the time to see her. But she was still running the show there. She had been moved four or five times from different wards, and she said: 'I am not moving again and that is what I have told them. This is exactly where I am staying, and that is that.' And apparently she stayed there until she finally went home.

She had a nasal-gastric tube in for feeding at that stage, because she could not physically eat. She had just come back from
surgery, where they had failed to put a more permanent line in through her stomach. There was liquid in the feeding apparatus and I asked, 'What flavour is it, Judith?' Silly me. She said: 'I don't know. It goes straight into my stomach and I can't taste it.' But, although she said it had all the nutrients, she was looking forward to eating again, which I understand never happened.

She was also looking forward very much to coming back to this very session. That is what was keeping her going. It was what was driving her. From the look in her eyes, she was determined that she was coming back. Right or wrong, she was going to join us for this session. She was disappointed that she was not coming back earlier. It was so sad when the chief whip announced that she had extended leave and was not coming back until June. Then, of course, even sadder, she left us.

Her funeral was a tribute to her life, to all she had achieved and to the esteem in which she was held across this chamber and across the parliament. I think it was nice for us to show that sense of strength and companionship and friendship to her family. It was a great display for her family.

We will miss her around the corridors and we will certainly miss her from our team. I offer my deepest sympathy to her sons and granddaughters. We shared stories about grandchildren from time to time. Judith was very proud of her family, and I think that in the end family always would have come first for Judith. We respect that in every senator who places their family at the highest level. Rest in peace, Judith.

Senator MOORE (Queensland) (13:26): The Biographical Dictionary of the Australian Senate will note Judith Adams's service. It will talk about when she came to join us, it will talk about all the committees she was on and the delegations she served on and it will also talk about her passion for issues such as the military, because of the various occasions she shared with them. But behind all of that there will be an absolute knowledge of a passionate, committed woman who gave her life to service and who loved being a senator.

It is very important that we share the joy that Judith Adams had for her time in this place. In her first speech she said she was here to represent the people of Western Australia, and she did. But more than that she represented the community across this country, and in particular the people who live in rural and regional areas, where her heart belonged. At Kojonup we saw that they knew her heart was in that area.

I know that people in this Senate cared for Judith Adams. The expressions of grief we share not only come from the people sitting in this chamber but, as I have seen in the last few days, also come consistently from others such as Comcar drivers and people in various other areas. They all talk about this wonderful woman—they knew she had been unwell—and how they will miss her. This session this afternoon gives some indication of the way she was valued. I think it is so important for her family that there are so many senators contributing to this session. That is a part of the value that Judith had. But I know that this whole institution, this wonderful place in which we serve, understands the way that Judith served in the Senate and the way she enjoyed being here.

Judith was born to be in the committee system! She loved talking with people. No matter where you were—it did not matter whether you were in Central Australia, upstairs in various committees, or travelling—you would find Judith having a chat. It was so important for her to hear what people had to say and to give them the opportunity to do so. She felt that the
committee system in this place was of value in learning to govern better—she believed that it should be a Liberal government, but nonetheless she wanted to make sure that we could govern better and the way we would do that would be to listen to the people who gave their time to come and talk with us. I had the real honour and pleasure to sit with her in so many committee hearings, as many senators have because she sat on so many committees. It would be interesting to see just how many senators here did not have the opportunity to join at some stage in a Senate committee with Judith Adams. She felt that was the way we would operate best as a Senate.

I so enjoyed listening to her asking her questions. Most of her questioning began with 'I'm from Western Australia,' and she went on to say 'from Kojonup,' as though we should all know where Kojonup was. By the end of the session we did. But in terms of the process it did not matter which issue we were talking about, and certainly from my experience I was mainly working with Judith in the areas of health and community affairs but I know also her passion in regional and rural. We have heard already from many senators about her absolutely resolute questioning and advocacy across so many areas. I do remember walking back from committees along that corridor from Senate estimates back to the Senate. We would have long walks back there together at 11 o'clock at night, when she would share her particular views on many important issues. I remember in our very first period she shared with me all about wheat and was quite disappointed that I did not know enough about wheat to respond. She was clear in her explanation. Senator Brandis talked about experience in the Liberal caucus. Whilst not breaching any confidentiality of another party caucus, she explained how she felt it was her job to put forward her view and it did not matter that she was a new senator, it does not matter how long you are here—you are here elected by your people to give your view. She took that extremely seriously.

Senator Siewert has spoken about some of the issues in community affairs which Judith held dear. We know of the issues around ovarian and breast cancer which she worked on so hard, and she talked very much about her own experiences. Being a cancer survivor was not something that Judith held back: she announced that she was a cancer survivor and talked about the work she had done in many committees in Western Australia. I rarely went to any organisation that had not known of Judith Adams and the work she had done. They all had respect for the ongoing advocacy.

We laugh about the most enjoyable aspects of Judith's activities on committees. I am not quite sure whether she more enjoyed being surrounded by professors of medicine and the repartee with them about what was going on in various policy areas, while strongly supporting the role of nurses and the position that nurses should be much more involved in some of those professions, or more enjoyed being surrounded, as we have heard, by various elements of the military. We have heard of the teasing that went on, but Judith had absolute respect for military service and showed sheer joy when she came back to describe her experiences in Northern Australia in the dirt, or the naval experiences where she managed to break an arm, though that did not stop her. It was an enthusiasm and a joy with which she was able to inspire others about this program and get them engaged. When she had various members of the services sharing time with her in her office, Judith would be scooting around this building at speed followed by young personnel from the different services, who were completely exhausted after they had spent this time with her. I talked with many
of them and they would say, 'We can't keep up.' They went away from their experience with great respect for Judith and also great respect for our institution.

No-one in the health and community services area could talk about Judith Adams without mentioning the words 'patient assisted travel'. This phrase has become synonymous with Judith Adams in this policy area. As we have heard, officers from the Department of Health and Ageing come well prepared to estimates, and will continue to do so, but particularly when Judith was asking questions they knew which areas she was going to delve into, and the area of patient assisted travel was certainly one. I know the officers and I know that they had the full brief every time to make sure that they knew what was going on. To these areas she brought her great professionalism because of her professional training, her lived experience and also her genuine compassion for people in need.

I first met Judith working across the chamber in the debate around RU-486. She was a relatively new senator at that stage and with others in the chamber actually had a direct and common-sense approach to the debate. It did not matter which particular position you took, she felt it was important to be true to yourself and to be absolutely clear on your position and be open about it. It did not matter how much pressure was being applied by advocates from either side; once you had made up your mind, your job was to be clear about that and to ensure that you followed through. That was the aspect of reliability. You were never unsure of the position Judith was going to take on any issue. She did not rush into making up her mind—she did clear research and spoke to as many people as she possibly could in the community and in the professional areas, and then she openly contributed to debate. I felt that was particularly important when we were talking about issues to do with improving health and improving the welfare of our community.

I have great memories of working with Judith in Aboriginal communities and seeing her talking with elders in local communities or with young mums with their bubs, being totally at ease and respecting their culture but being very open about what she felt was the way we should work together to move forward, and knowing at times she was up against people who had great disagreement with her position. Nonetheless, she treated everybody with respect and ensured that people understood that there are processes to go through but her overwhelming compassion was with the individual and the community. So, even if there was disagreement, her heart was there to be seen and people respected that. We saw that very often.

A number of us were with Judith the day she heard her husband had died and also subsequently when she heard that she had lost her mum. On both occasions she worked with us and almost tried to make us feel better, because it is never an easy thing to deal with someone who has had loss. She was aware that we were caring about her and tried to make us feel better. I think that is a wonderful aspect of her personality. I will miss her professionalism. I will miss her reliability. We have heard about that. It is always important to know that there is someone who cares when you are working on difficult issues. I certainly will miss the fact that Judith would always care about you as a person. I cannot remember a time in the last five years that she did not ask me about how my health was. That was at times when I knew that her own health was not great, but her first issue was always: 'How are you holding up? Have you been to the doctor? When are your tests coming back?' That was her issue. That was how she dealt with
everybody. I know that. Many people in this chamber shared that side of Judith. It was always her care for others.

We will miss Judith, but her memory will be strong and her impact on policy will be strong. I know that she is somewhere there watching us, and we will know that we will have to be on side to ensure that we keep up the quality of the work that we do. I know that the extension of the bowel cancer screening will meet with her approval. I have to admit that when I heard that that policy was being put forward I was very pleased, and I know that Judith will be pleased by that.

In terms of her family, to Stuart and Robert: thank you for sharing Judith with us. It is a big call. Those senators from Western Australia do extra travel to get across to so much of the work we do, and we know that they have that extra time. Judith always spent that time well. There are a number of ministers, shadow ministers and parliamentary secretaries who shared that flight from Perth to Canberra many times who got off that plane very relieved that Judith was no longer talking with them about the various issues she was following up—because she was a fearless advocate. She would then check in with me and say that she had spoken to so-and-so and she thought they had got the message now. I know quite a few Labor ministers who were on that particular flight who know that they did get the message very well! To Stuart and Robert and the family: thank you. We share your loss, and we share your pride as well. Thank you to Judith Adams.

Senator NASH (New South Wales—Deputy Leader of The Nationals in the Senate) (13:39): I rise also to speak on the condolence motion and concur with many of the remarks that have already been made in this chamber about Judith Adams. I came in with Judith in 2005 and we shared a lot of similar thoughts about many issues. We were both women—clearly—and we were both farmers and we were the only two rural women who came in in that intake in 2005. Regardless of the fact that we were from different sides of the nation, there were so many similar issues in communities over on this side and communities over on the other side of the nation.

She was a fierce Liberal; I am a fierce National. Very occasionally, we would bump heads on issues where there was certainly no agreement. She was absolutely tenacious. She was the most tenacious person I have ever come across in this place, because when there was an issue that she believed in, that she wanted changed, that she wanted some action on, she just would not let go. She was truthful. She was genuine. She was honest. I think one of the really important things about Judith in this day and age, where so many people do not particularly hold politicians in very high regard, is that she gave politicians a good name. She was so well respected by those who knew her and, while—as I think Senator Evans said earlier—she was not a household name in the papers, the people who knew her knew how incredibly diligent she was in her work and how much she put into the job.

She was in some ways such a contradiction. She was always such a lady. She was always well groomed. She always had her earrings on. And yet at the same time she could absolutely mix it with the blokes. I think Senator Brandis hit it on the head earlier when he said that she had even the Prime Minister's measure at the time when she came in—and she truly did; you could see that. I think it is particularly salient that he points that out.

She was a ferocious advocate for Western Australia, and through the whole single-
desk-for-wheat debate we saw that very, very clearly. That was probably one of the very few issues we disagreed on. I can remember going to Senate inquiries on the single-desk issue. Judith and I would be sitting next to each other, and it would be very, very, very chilly, to say the least, but we had great respect for each other's ability and each other's need to take the position that each had taken. I think we were always courteous about it. It was probably one of the hottest issues we have ever dealt with in this place. She was amazing. She believed in what she knew was right, in her view, for the people of Western Australia. All I can say is: you won that one, Judith.

She was an extraordinary lady. When I went to the service in WA, as so many others did, somebody said to me, 'Isn't it a shame that it's not until somebody passes and we're at their service that we find out so much about them, the person that they were and their lives?' I think that was really true particularly for Judith's service because I felt like I knew a little bit about her, but after that day, all with of those wonderful people saying extraordinary things about Judith and her extraordinary life, it was not until she had actually left us that I felt like I really knew her. It is probably a sad thing but a wonderful thing to have gained that knowledge and gained that insight. I think it will always be ironic that I have seen Wilson Tuckey cry but never Judith.

Her committee work, as everybody has mentioned, was extraordinary. The committees she was on: the Senate Standing Committees on Community Affairs, the Senate Standing Committees on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport, which I was on with her, the Selection of Bills Committee, the Senate Standing Committee of Senators' Interests, the Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories—the list just went on. It just indicates her incredible breadth of interest in and extensive knowledge of such a variety of issues, from rural and regional to community affairs and health to defence. Some of us have some expertise in areas here and there; Judith had expertise in such a wide range of so many issues. I think it really reflects the woman she was, coming from a regional community, where all of those things are important, that she was so representative of such a broad spectrum of the community.

Her travelling was legendary. Her work in estimates was extraordinary. I can always remember Judith in estimates or in hearings. It would be Judith's turn to start asking some questions. You could see it coming. She would normally start with, 'Right,' and you thought, 'Here it comes.' Those on the other side of the table were just waiting for it, and off Judith would go with her relentless questioning. I absolutely admire the work she put into the detail of that committee work, and the contribution that she made was just extraordinary. I remember one of her last hearings that we attended in Broome. She was extraordinary. She was so ill and yet she travelled all that way because it was important to her that she be there. As Senator Moore said earlier, it was more important that those other people were able to have their say and that they were heard on what they wanted to put forward about the issues that were important to them. Judith saw that as being so incredibly important. Occasionally, we will not make it to something but Judith made sure that she was always there insofar as she possibly could. That necessitates an enormous amount of admiration from us and certainly makes me feel as though I have not achieved what she had in that level of dedication to service to this place.

Her children are incredibly proud of her. To her boys Stuart and Robert, I extend my
very sincere condolences to you and to the family. She was an extraordinary lady and a mother, I know, that they are extremely proud of—and so they should be. She was an extraordinary advocate for regional communities, particularly in Western Australia and those communities, as we in this place, are sorely going to miss her.

Senator MILNE (Tasmania—Leader of the Australian Greens) (13:45): I rise today to express my sadness and to support the condolence motion on the death of Senator Judith Adams. I certainly want to convey my best wishes to her two sons Stuart and Robert and to her granddaughters.

Senator Adams was elected at the same time as I was. We were all part of what we refer to among ourselves as the class of 2004. I remember very keenly her first speech. I remember it because it was so different. She stood up and said, 'I am really proud to be one of the oldest women elected to the Australian Senate.' It was a cutting-through thing to say because it was about valuing life's experience. She went on to say, 'Life experience cannot be bought or traded.' It was just such a statement of where she was going to come from as a senator representing Western Australia. Then she went on to talk about the life experience she had had and how she hoped to bring that life experience to her parliamentary life. She talked about the fact that she had had this long history in her family of association with the military, from Gallipoli to her mother's experience as a nurse and her own, her own engagement in the military, how proud she was of that and how Anzac Day made her reflect on the values of Australia, but particularly in the military.

She also talked of her experiences in rural and regional Australia. I was interested in that because I was sitting there thinking we will have a quite a bit in common because she talked about the impact of salinity in Western Australia. She talked about feral animals and the need for appropriate quarantine. She talked about a whole range of issues from which I then got to know her better on the rural and regional committee. I sat on that committee with Judith over many years and with my colleagues in here as she raised a number of those issues.

I thought it was interesting that she brought the combination of her background as a nurse with her total identification with rural and regional Australia, and that her husband Gordon had been a pilot with the Royal Flying Doctor Service. They knew the remote communities around Western Australia collectively and individually from their different experiences. She brought that commitment for rural issues, for rural health issues as well as environmental sustainability issues. She often talked about the need for greater attention to mental health support for rural communities, particularly in times when the drought was making things very difficult.

Her hard work has already been talked about here and she certainly was a keen worker on all of those community consultations through the committee system. But her stoicism was characteristic of Australian women, particularly older Australian women who have been incredibly stoic having experienced some pretty tough things in their lifetime. Judith faced her long battle with cancer and other sorts of things with that personal resilience she had, with courage in being an advocate for cancer sufferers and for people in rural and regional Australia who need access to health services and also, as has been discussed, her resilience at the time of the death of her husband.

I remember talking to her then. This was when her depth of experience and her rural experience, particularly, came to hand. She
talked about at what point will we deal with the issue of succession planning in rural and regional Australia, helping people to get from the farm and hand over to their children, the next generation. How are they going to manage it? She talked often about being worried that she and Gordon probably needed to leave the farm, to sell and go. She thought that through, that he was taking longer to come to the same conclusion, which is often the case. It was certainly the case in my own family. It is the case you find in most rural communities. She often talked about this being not a simple policy matter; this is a cultural context and we have to talk about ways to help people make these really hard decisions. People who have identified so long with one place, one community, one property—they know it like the back of their hand.

I remember having those conversations with her and thinking she was really able to represent the voice of her communities. She has lived it, she has experienced it and she has led a lot of others through those difficult decisions. She was a good person. She was generous; she was kind; and she was compassionate.

As Senator Moore and my colleague Senator Siewert said, she recognised through the committee system of the Senate the opportunity to develop relationships across party politics and to work to put the issue above politics, where she possibly could. She certainly had a view about how things should be done; but, where she could, she saw the value of building alliances and maximising the strength of those alliances to get outcomes for people. As such, she was certainly a valued colleague in this Senate. She was a good senator for Western Australia, she was a loving mother and, as I said, she was a respected and valued colleague. I will finish by reminding people what Senator Adams said in her first speech:

… I will do my best to represent you with honesty, sincerity and integrity.

And she did.

**Senator WILLIAMS** (New South Wales—Nationals Whip in the Senate) (13:52): I rise to say a few words in this condolence motion. My time with the late Senator Judith Adams was while working in the whip's position. What a wonderful time it was to work with Judith. Senator Joyce and others today have mentioned the strength of the lady. Look at her history. She was a nurse in Vietnam; imagine what she would have had to endure there. She had the strength of character to represent Western Australia, especially regional Australia, with her passion for the bush. Sadly, there was the sudden death of her husband, Gordon, just a couple of years ago. This all shows how strong Judith was. She was not one to complain. She was probably suffering more pain physically than any of us here—but never a complaint. Generally, I do not think I ever had a cross word with Senator Adams, except for a couple of times when she brought up a particular member of parliament—I think it was the former member for O'Connor. Sometimes we preferred to steer around that discussion anyway, which we did! But it was a pleasure to work with Judith—as I said, a strong woman.

We must mention those in the medical profession who, no doubt, over many years, assisted not only Senator Adams but also many other Australians. At times we hear people criticise our health system, our medical system, but those workers are so professional and do so much good. I would like to thank them for all the assistance they gave Senator Adams through a long period of illness, coming good and then falling back a bit until the inevitable end. They also need a special mention.
To Judith's sons and her grandchildren, I say: be proud of what your mother and grandmother has achieved, and of her passion for this place and her passion for this country. It is with sadness that we observe her passing. I support the motion.

Senator CAROL BROWN (Tasmania—Deputy Government Whip in the Senate) (13:54): I would like to make a short contribution to this condolence motion for Senator Judith Adams. It was with great sadness that I learnt that Judith had passed away after her long battle with cancer. I just want to relate a short story. I was in Kingston, in Tasmania—actually, Senator Abetz lives around that area somewhere—and I was at the local swimming pool, talking to the owner. She said, 'It must be hard being a senator, with all the long hours that you have to work,' and I said, 'Oh, yes; it is.' Then she said, 'But you're not the only senator that I know.' I said, 'Who else do you know?' thinking: of course it is going to be the bane of my life—Senator Abetz's name is going to pop up! But it was Senator Judith Adams. In the words of the pool owner, 'She's the most wonderful senator. She works so hard for Western Australia. We were such good mates and we haven't caught up for a while.' This was in February. Such was the impact of Judith that someone that she had not seen for a long time, who had since moved to Tasmania, still considered her a great mate. It was as if she had just seen Judith yesterday, and I know that she was very sad when the news came through that Judith had lost her battle with cancer.

Judith made a great contribution during her time in the Senate. I of course knew Judith mostly through our membership of the Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs. As we have heard from everybody today here, she was well liked by members of all political persuasions. I know that all our thoughts are with her family and friends. Judith was first elected to represent Western Australia in the Senate in 2004 and again in 2010. At 62 she was the second oldest woman to enter the Senate, a fact she was very proud of—and we have heard that here today. I know this to be a fact because she told me she was very proud of it when she gave me a long lecture on something I had not got right.

During her time in the Senate, Judith was a strong advocate for her home state of Western Australia as well as for people living in regional and remote areas. She had a rich and varied life, both while she was a senator and before she entered parliament. We all know that Judith started off life as a Kiwi before she became an Aussie, and she trained as a nurse. In 1968, I understand, Judith moved to Western Australia and continued her hard work, helping others with her training by being a relief matron and midwife through rural and remote parts of the state. She also demonstrated her passion for the health sector, as she was a councillor to the Australian Healthcare and Hospitals Association and a member of the National Rural Health Alliance. I mention these roles because it was these many and varied roles that Judith was involved in throughout her life that made her the passionate and experienced member of the Senate that she was. Judith was well respected and she will be greatly missed by her family, her friends, her parliamentary colleagues and her constituents.

I have also been asked to pass on the sincere condolences of former senator Natasha Stott-Despoja, who wanted to express her sympathy to Judith's family and friends, and to remember the wonderful group of cross-party women that Judith was part of and the work that Judith did on many of the private member's bills that have been mentioned here today, most particularly on pregnancy counselling.
I would also like to strongly support the words of Senator Abetz today, when he described Judith as a great senator but above all a great person. I will finish by quoting Judith herself, who said in her maiden speech, which has also been mentioned by Senator Milne today:

Life experience cannot be bought or traded. I believe this sentiment fittingly sums up the active and diverse life that Judith led and pays tribute to her contribution as a senator. Thank you, Senator Adams.

Senator JOHNSTON (Western Australia) (13:59): In supporting my leader’s motion, I want to begin by offering to Judith’s two sons, Stuart and Robert—both of whom I know quite well—and their families my deepest condolences on the passing of your mother, your mother-in-law, your grandmother. She was a dear friend and colleague who was taken from us far too soon. I also wish to pay my respects and offer my thanks to Judith’s staff, who supported her so well when she was in treatment, kept the wheels turning for her when she was not able to do so herself and who had the sombre task of packing up her office after she died. I know that could not have been an easy task. Judith was very grateful for your support and I know she kept you busy right up until the end, because she certainly never stopped working and expected as much from her office.

I visited Judith in hospital a few weeks before her death and she was sitting up checking her BlackBerry, still entirely focused on work and the issues of the day. She never let her illness get in the way of her work and responsibilities as a senator—never ever; it was a job she loved to the very end. Even after the death of her husband, Gordon, in 2008 and her diagnosis three months later of secondary breast cancer, she could not stop her from participating in her senatorial duties. She refused to wallow and just simply got on with it. I think her full workload helped her to keep going. She was that sort of person. Her strength made her almost seem indestructible, and it makes it harder to believe that she is not with us in this chamber anymore. Judith brought to the Senate, in her own words, ‘the background, the experience and the will to represent WA’, and she had a lot of each of those. She was the second oldest woman to be elected to the Australian Senate but she had the energy of many senators half her age.

Trained as a nurse and a midwife in New Zealand, she cut her teeth in rural health in Western Australia and met Gordon in Meekatharra, of all places, where he worked as a pilot for the Royal Flying Doctor Service. With her husband, Gordon, she raised two sons and farmed for 35 years in her beloved Kojonup in the deep south of Western Australia. When elected to the Senate in 2004, Judith travelled widely around Western Australia and threw herself into issues affecting Western Australians. Following her diagnosis, she was an outspoken advocate for women with breast cancer, particularly those living in rural and remote areas. She pushed for the national rebate scheme for breast prostheses and also championed improvements in, as we have heard, the Patient Assistance Travel Scheme. If I did not know anything about the Patient Assistance Travel Scheme before I met Judith, I certainly do now. Judith's advocacy and hard work for the issues facing regional Australia, particularly in health care, are unrivalled in this chamber and are a model for us all. Rural women will benefit from Judith’s work for many, many years to come. I know she would be proud of these achievements, but they were achievements that she saw were necessary; they were not about any accolades for herself.
She was also a very strong supporter of the Australian Defence Force, having served in Vietnam as a theatre nurse in the New Zealand Territorial Army before her move to Western Australia. She also took part in several tours, particularly with the Navy, in the Australian Defence Force Parliamentary Program. Many a former Chief of Navy would say to me that they thought Judith Adams had more sea time than they did.

I am very proud to have been a colleague and a fellow West Australian Liberal in the Senate alongside Judith Adams. She was a very wise counsel over the years and a true and loyal friend. She was also a loyal servant of the Liberal Party and a tremendous asset to any lower house member lucky enough to have her helping in their campaign for election. Judith was instrumental in the campaign for the member for Hasluck, Mr Ken Wyatt, our first Indigenous representative in the House of Representatives. Hasluck was, and continues to be, one of the most marginal seats in Australia. Judith relished the challenge and, as they say, the rest is electoral history. She got Ken over the line at the last election, and we hold her in great and high esteem for that achievement. More recently she set up Liberal House in Albany, a second office to reach out to the Great Southern region of Western Australia. Judith was determined to have the seat of O'Connor return to Liberal hands, where it belongs. I am sure we will all work hard to ensure that her aspiration, her dedication, to get that seat back is achieved. Her tremendous efforts will not be forgotten when we do successfully return that seat to the fold at the next federal election.

Judith was such a decent and respected senator. She was well-liked and highly regarded by members and senators of all political parties. I know she was particularly chuffed while in hospital to receive a giant get-well card from all the Labor senators who wrote such kind and supportive words to her. I pause to thank you all for that.

We farewelled Judith on what would have been her 69th birthday. People came from all over Australia to say goodbye. She would have been humbled by the turnout. Members and senators came from all over the country and were joined by our federal leader, Tony Abbott, and WA Premier Colin Barnett. The former member for O'Connor, the Hon. Wilson Tuckey, gave the eulogy, and it really was a touching tribute to a great lady. May I pause to thank all the non-Liberal members and senators who attended, who travelled so far to be there and pay their respects. It was truly a magnanimous and gracious gesture.

Even though she was taken from us far too soon, Judith packed more into her life than most of us can ever aspire to. In simple terms, she was a doer. Rather than sitting back complaining about what should be done or who should do it, she went ahead and did it herself without fanfare and without seeking acclaim. The Liberal Party has lost one of its finest, but she will not be forgotten. Thank you, Judith, for being such a fantastic representative for our state of Western Australia and for the Liberal Party, but, more importantly, thank you for being a loyal and true friend. We will all miss you dearly.

Senator McEWEN (South Australia—Government Whip in the Senate) (14:06): I too stand to support the condolence motion for a very fine senator, Senator Judith Adams. I would like to pay tribute to her with a few words. We commenced in the Senate together on 1 July 2005. We attended 'senator school' as well and together we learnt the ropes of how to be a senator—and didn't she turn out to be a fine senator, indeed! It was a great privilege for me to be able to attend her funeral, her memorial
service, at Kojonup, a place I had never been to before. It was wonderful to see the whole community there turn out to pay tribute to their friend and community member. I will never forget her first speech in the Senate, when she so proudly announced that she was the second-oldest woman ever to be elected to the Senate. It has resonated in my heart ever since. She continued to be a fantastic advocate for and supporter of women, particularly rural and regional women. She attended every rural women's conference, event and function that you could imagine and did it with such great enthusiasm. She told us in her first speech that she was a survivor of breast cancer and, as everybody has said in this chamber, that horrible disease never actually left her, but it certainly never stopped Judith from doing everything that she wanted to do in the Senate, and it is such a great shame that she has gone from us so early.

I also remember her as an avid participant in the ADF Parliamentary Program. What a credit to the Senate she was for all the programs that she attended with so much enthusiasm. It was a fine tribute to see members of the Defence Force turn up to her memorial service. As Senator Moore said, whenever you spoke to them about Senator Adams's participation in those programs, they spoke about her with such genuine affection and awe for the kind of workload that she undertook.

Senator Judith Adams was a whip, and us whips like to stick together. It was a pleasure to work with her in her capacity as a whip. My staff and I can attest to her patience, her good humour always and her commitment to the many nitty-gritty, day-to-day whipping jobs that you have to do. She could be a harsh critic of bad behaviour in the chamber, both on your side, opposition senators, and certainly on our side. She never held back when it came to pointing out what she thought was inappropriate behaviour in the Senate, because she held this place in such high regard. Like all good whips, she understood that the functioning of the Senate depends so much on cooperation, a great deal of cooperation. But, unlike a number of senators who do not appreciate the grand principle of 'what goes around comes around', Senator Adams certainly understood it and applied that to her whipping duties. I should say that, when strategy required it or when opposition imperatives required it, Judith could be as deliberately obtuse as any other senator and her focus was always to protect her team in the Senate and her party, and you should be very proud of what she did in that regard.

During the long hours that a whip spends in the chamber, you often wander over and sit with the whip on the other side to have a general chat about things. I always looked forward to those occasions with Senator Adams, because she had such an amazing life. She had views on everything. She would never withhold her views on anything. She had great insights into human behaviour, which I found very useful in my job as whip. Overall she was always extremely compassionate and kind. Whenever we had those chats she would always have an extraordinary intelligence about what was happening on this side in terms of people's personal health and other issues that people might have in their job. She would always ask, 'How are your lot travelling?' and she would know more about people than you would ever expect, and that is because she had such great respect from everybody that people would share personal knowledge and information with her.

My condolences to her family and friends, particularly her two boys, Stuart and Robert, and their families. They gave wonderful eulogies at the memorial service. I think I will take away from that how they referred to
their mother, Senator Judith Adams, as 'Senator Mum'. We will miss her.

Senator SCULLION (Northern Territory—Deputy Leader of The Nationals) (14:11): I rise also to support this condolence motion for the late Senator Judith Adams. I can recall meeting Judith sometime in 2004, when we were doing all the 'baby senator' sessions. Judith basically bounced up to me in the corridor. I was having a bloke moment; I was really trying to put together who I was talking to. Within two minutes of that conversation, I realised she was talking to me because she wanted to understand who I was, what my role was here and what I knew that might be useful to anybody, and she left about 10 minutes later. I was quite exhausted, feeling husk-like. She had certainly taken away almost every piece of valuable information that she thought was appropriate. She left me and I shook my head and thought: 'There is someone who has been somewhere. She seems to have an insight into everything.' She left me with the impression that she was really going to make a significant contribution to the Senate, and that she did.

So many people around here have talked about Judith's experience and why she was able to make such a wonderful contribution. I know she would want me to preface these remarks by saying that I in no way want to diminish the young and shiny senators who have come here with bright ideas, but I think the vast breadth of experience and diversity that, as an individual, she brought to this place really enabled her to make the special contribution she did.

If we can think about her life for a minute—we have already touched on so many of those areas—Judith was brought up in a little town, Picton, in New Zealand. Imagine, as a young woman, suddenly being a scrub nurse in a surgical team in Vietnam in 1967. That sort of experience is obviously something that Judith was about. In many of our conversations in committee hearings she would share little titbits. Again, as Senator Nash indicated, sometimes it is only with someone's passing that you realise the depth of that experience. She shared with me her time in Vietnam. We had both worked inside theatre in previous lives. She was able to give such an insight into what it was like then and how much it had changed. We talked about how strange it is that you can be out of the health system only for a blink and you are out of date because technology changes so fast. We had a conversation about how we can ensure that particularly women who leave to have children, to look after a family or to enter another workforce can better gain access back into a system that is so valuable and is a function of their participation. Such a practical approach by Judith came from such deep experience. Being a nurse in regional and rural Australia, being married to a Royal Flying Doctor Service pilot, bringing up a couple of kids in regional Australia, working off the land in a small business, in a sheep farm in Kojonup—all these vast experiences brought everything that was Judith to this place. I spent a lot of time with Judith, particularly over a six-month period on the Senate Select Committee on Regional and Remote Indigenous Communities. I know many of us here spent time together on that committee. Whilst it has been touched on before, I have to reflect for a moment on Judith's ability to be pretty seriously robust. Without mentioning the place, there was an individual who effectively tried to slander a number of other people in his community. It was pretty ugly. We were all looking at each other, not knowing what to do. But, of course, Judith was the first to say: 'Excuse me, Chair. Look, mate, this is not the place for this. If you have evidence about these things then you
can tell us.' She was there to protect the process. She knew what was right instinctively and did not need reminding.

All of that experience that Judith brought with her here she also used outside in the community. She was always off somewhere. She would say: 'You're going to have to talk to this other group of people. I have spoken to this family.' You would say, 'But the schedule is full.' She would say: 'We'll be right. We'll fit them in. It's going to be really important evidence.' In those times she would wander away and seemed to have the capacity to connect so quickly with people that they had the confidence to speak to her. In Indigenous communities it can be very difficult to have the confidence to say to someone: 'I would really like to say something. I have something important to say, but I am not sure how to do it.' They always saw Judith as that lodestone. They would go to that beacon, and she would make sure that we had the capacity to listen to the remarks of those individuals. On her passing, we have heard this reported from so many different sides of the political divide, from pretty much anyone, across the political divide, who has given evidence to the committees. I think that really is a reflection that whilst she was on the right side of parliament—she would expect me to say that—she genuinely had a bipartisan approach to these matters. While she was a very strong Liberal, and politics was something she played hard, her first concern was the interests of her community, her constituency and her country.

I can recall very clearly the incident in the party room with John Howard when we were all getting a bit of a sense that, as Senator Brandis indicated, there were no baubles that could be hung before her—'Perhaps we can do this for your community or that.' There was none of that. But it was interesting to see the other side of Judith. She would say, 'I am here to be persuaded, but you have not done it so far; you have a day to convince me,' or 'I have a day to get back to them, and what you have said is not enough.' But she was genuinely there to be persuaded and, if you could give a significant argument that filled the gaps that she required be filled—and she was quite happy to articulate them—then she would take that on board and she would change her mind on some issues.

I know the people who operate the Australian Defence Force Parliamentary Program will miss her dearly. She was a great ambassador for all parliamentarians. So many of the people in my garrison town of Darwin in the Northern Territory say: 'When we met Judith it was fantastic. We now know politicians are real people. Isn't that amazing?' As a parliamentarian she was a great ambassador for how good we can be in this place. She certainly was in every aspect of her life. If you seek public life, and certainly if you come here as a senator, she would be the ideal model.

We have heard that she fought a long battle with cancer. She did that with rare dignity and courage. I can recall an interview she gave with Breast Cancer Network Australia. When asked how cancer had affected her work, she said: 'My term expires in June 2011. I am honoured to be preselected to contest the next election.' She was basically saying: 'What is your point? What is your issue? This is my work. I am continuing in my work. Just because I have had cancer does not mean I should possibly think about—if this is what you are alluding to in the question—giving up. That is certainly not what I am going to do.' It was a very fierce answer from someone who really believed that she should lead by example.

I can recall just before we came in here one day when she was in the wheelchair I said, 'How's it going?' and I put my arm
around her. She said, 'Oh, this bloody thing, Nigel, is just so annoying.' If anybody did not know Judith they would have said, 'I understand.' Then she went on to say: 'The bloody doctors gave me the wrong chemo. But it's all right; we've got the right one now. But my feet are bugging me.' It was just such an annoyance. It was getting in the way of the work and that was a complete annoyance. It was not a frustration about her own level of amenity. That was absolutely classic Judith. I think she was just such an example to us all.

In terms of the politics in the Liberal Party, Senator Dean Smith, I understand that you are automatically election ready, mate. She made sure everything right up to the last minute in a political sense was all in order. That again was classic Judith. A wife, midwife, nurse, soldier, farmer, mother and senator—there were few tougher than Judith Adams. I would like to put on record my admiration for my mate and colleague and pass on my sincere condolences to her sons, Stuart and Robbie, her extended family, staff and friends.

Senator PRATT (Western Australia) (14:21): I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to someone who I believe was a fine Western Australian and someone I greatly admired and respected. Western Australia has lost a true friend and advocate. I knew Judith as someone who concentrated much of her time on issues affecting rural and regional Western Australia. Indeed, my last interaction with Judith was something along these lines. She was expressing her concern to me that she may not make it to the Liberal council meeting being held somewhere in country Western Australia. My colleagues opposite will be able to tell me where. She was expressing her distress that she might be too unwell to go. I do not know if she made it to that meeting or not, but I did encourage her to take some time to look after herself.

But, as we have all paid tribute to today, she always portrayed amazing resilience in her cancer treatment, and no more so than when she was diagnosed with secondary cancer within weeks of her husband dying. Her resilience as a person was quite extraordinary. When she spoke of how she coped with that situation, she spoke about how she focused on her treatment and on her work. So I would like to pay tribute to the many important issues that Senator Adams pursued in her career—things that are not necessarily the cut and thrust of day to day partisan politics but the kinds of issues that we as senators all like to get into the nitty-gritty of and make progress on through things like parliamentary committees. These include everything from gene patents to petrol sniffing, as we have heard today, and access to quality midwifery services. She also focused on hearing services, rural and remote communities and the situation of Indigenous communities. There were so many really important issues that she was deeply involved in.

I have to say that it is really important in public life to have people who are prepared to share their personal journeys with others, particularly others who are in the same boat. Judith certainly had a lot to share in terms of her very interesting and diverse life. Importantly, she also did this with her experience of breast cancer. I know she undertook the Breast Cancer Network Australia's Advocacy and Science Training course, and I think that is a tribute to her dedication to doing public advocacy around an issue that had also affected her so personally. She spoke about the importance of talking to people in the same boat as her. She also spoke of the incredible importance of women living with breast cancer being able to continue to work. That was an important way of managing the disease. I think this is an important lesson for everyone
as we deal with adversity in life. Judith said, and I think these are words that truly deserve to be on the record in this chamber and that served as an inspiration to people with cancer and served as an inspiration to people I know who have also lived with cancer:

I live with cancer but I do not let it control my life.

Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS (New South Wales) (14:25): I too rise to pay tribute to our late colleague, Senator Judith Adams. I was part of the class of 2004, which various colleagues have spoken about today. Whilst most of my colleagues of the class of 2004 started on 1 July 2005, I filled a vacancy earlier than that and so it fell to me to convene the gatherings of the class of 2004. I must say that we had some very good gatherings. We have lost some along the way to preselection and there have been various losses at election, but Judith’s passing remains our saddest loss.

In her maiden speech, as colleagues have referred to, she spoke about the challenge of the Howard government’s workforce participation policy to keep mature age, experienced people in the workplace. Of course, she proudly spoke as the second oldest woman to have entered the Senate. The oldest woman to have entered the Senate was also a Western Australian, and Judith reminded us of that. As shadow minister for ageing, can I pay tribute to a senior Australian who, as Senator Johnston said, packed a lot into a lifetime.

As Senator Milne and other colleagues have mentioned, she talked about life experience and the fact that it cannot be bought or traded. She certainly did use her life experiences very well. When one looks at the diversity of that—general nursing, maternity and midwifery, certificates, post-basic diploma in operating theatre nursing, being a justice of the peace, a farmer and a rural health consultant—she certainly used her life experience. Her life experience gave her a great grounding for her work in this place and most especially in the community affairs committee. I think Senator Moore mentioned comments about nurses. Some of the stories Judith told us about life in the operating theatre and some of the things that happened in operating theatres she had been in certainly raised a few eyebrows, but we will not go there. Her passion for rural health mattered especially at estimates. Senator Moore, maybe they will give the PATS memorial award through community affairs. I think I will leave it to you to raise that at our next estimates.

Can I place on record my deep appreciation for her efforts in the Health and Ageing portfolio. As the shadow responsible for that portfolio here in the Senate, I know that Judith was invaluable in her contribution, in the work that she did and the various tasks that she willingly took up, particularly her work on the Senate committees. I know that I speak for the other shadows in this portfolio—Mr Dutton, Mr Laming and Dr Southcott—in placing our appreciation for her efforts on the record. At the February estimates we missed her and we will miss her very, very much in the future.

On a personal note, I want to place on record how grateful I and most especially my husband, John, were and are to Judith for her guidance and support when in 2009 my husband was diagnosed with cancer. I remember one night, sitting at Leigh’s, she sat with John and explained what was to come. She shared with him how she had dealt with the challenges in her battle with cancer. I know how valuable this was to my husband. During his radiotherapy she wrote to him. She always asked me about him. Maybe she had a soft spot because he was a former naval officer. I think that is probably what it was. She always took the opportunity...
to take him aside. In the gatherings when my husband on various occasions has come down to Canberra she always took him aside and wanted to know how he was and how he was coping and offered him words of comfort despite her own ongoing battle with demon cancer. This was so typical of Judith's stoic character, her determination to take adversity within her stride.

Senator Parry spoke of her sense of humour. An example of this was her wearing olive green on the day we debated the tobacco legislation. Of course, colleagues would recall that the olive industry was up in arms against Minister Roxon's use of olive green as the colour for the plain packaging. This was Judith's silent defiance on that day, but it did not go unnoticed. I conclude by offering my condolences to Stuart and Robert and the family. For John and me it was a real honour to be present at the wonderful celebration of her life in Kojonup. Rest in peace, Judith.

Senator POLLEY (Tasmania—Deputy Government Whip in the Senate) (14:31): I too rise this afternoon to speak in support of this condolence motion for Senator Adams. There is still some debate as to whether we are the class of 2004 or the class of 2005, which is pretty typical of the class of 2005. I say that, because Judith left an instant impression when I first turned up to Senate school. She was forthright, had an opinion and was not backwards in coming forward. At the same time she was friendly. When she came to this place she broke the mould. It has been touched on by other senators this afternoon that she was a mature woman when she came here. With that came an enormous amount of determination. She was here to prove wrong those who were concerned about her being too old. She was going to represent her state and make sure they all knew she could do the job. From the contributions around the chamber thus far—I am sure there are more to come—it seems she has left a mark on all of us and set a benchmark for us to aspire to achieve as senators.

Some of the words that come to my mind when I think of Judith, and I think most people would agree, are that she was known not only in this chamber but in her community as being determined, strong, courageous, hardworking, forthright, outspoken when necessary, loyal, passionate, warm, friendly and engaging. One could also say that she was a communicator. I admired her work not only on the committee on which I served with her—the Standing Committee on Community Affairs—but also as a deputy whip. But it reminds me that being a whip is a dangerous occupation. Unfortunately, since I came to this place with Judith we have lost two sitting senators: Jeannie Ferris and now Judith. Both were remarkable women in their own right.

We have heard about Judith's contributions through the committee system. I respect that contribution, but I have also been on the receiving end of Judith's passion when we held opposing positions on some contentious issues. They have already been highlighted in the chamber, but they included the debates over RU486 and stem cell research, to name a couple. As an advocate on the side opposing Judith's, I can say she was always compelling with her argument, but most of all she respected that each and every one of us could have a view, even though we might differ. There were times when she was very forthright in her views on those issues. I was in the minority as far as women on that committee, but I respected the fact that she respected me for having a different view and she ensured that those who had a different view always had the right to have a voice.

I always felt that Judith was approachable. It did not matter what the issues were—I
travelled with her when we had community affairs committee inquiries into petrol sniffing, disability and ageing—she was always there to listen. The public, or in that case the media, do not always respect that in this chamber we work together very closely across and around the chamber. We spend a lot of time travelling and, as others have said, dining together. You really do get to know each other. You have enormous respect and, I would go so far as to say, have some very good friendships. In some ways, the friendships across the chamber can be stronger than some of those we have within our own parties.

I remember that when Judith first came in she would tell me how she was representing then Prime Minister John Howard and that she was going here and there. I said, 'Judith, you are going to have to pace yourself.' She said, 'Helen, someone has to do it.' I think that sums her up. She was one of those in this place who always put their hand up. She was always the first to say yes; I do not think she actually knew the word no.

She was a passionate advocate for health, particularly on issues affecting rural and regional areas of Australia. We know the work she did on ovarian cancer and breast cancer. These are just a few of the issues that she was passionate about. With her background in health, there is no reason she would not be a strong advocate. She knew what she was talking about. She was able to cut through a lot of the nonsense and get to the core of the issue.

Talking about the whips' duties—my whip is a very important person; what she says goes—you do spend a lot of time in the chamber. Late at night you wander across and chat with whoever is on duty on the other side. I have to say that it did not matter whether we were sitting late into the night or how contentious were the issues and legislation we were debating, she always had a good sense of humour—you could always approach her. I admired and respected her for that. When it comes to her life's achievements, there is no doubt that she had the love of her husband, her two wonderful sons and her extended family. Judith has left her mark—one that we, as I said before, could all aspire to as senators. But I think she will be remembered most, both by me and by everyone in this chamber and beyond, because she was not only a good senator but a good person—a caring and compassionate Australian. I even forgave her for being a New Zealander originally!

We often say in this place, particularly at a time like this, that we must make the most of every day. As those who were able to attend the memorial service would know, and as we have heard in the contributions this afternoon, Judith Adams lived and made the most of every single day, and with that life experience she enriched this chamber. I would like to place on record my deep respect for her and my condolences to her family. I appreciate that everyone here has made a contribution. I think that says a lot about Judith as an individual. Forget about the tag of Labor or Liberal; she was a member of this chamber whom we could all go to and who was compassionate and caring towards each and every one of us. I think we can all take a leaf out of her book. It is a chapter that is now closed but one that will live on.

Senator BIRMINGHAM (South Australia) (14:38): As I rise in my place the air around my desk here is rich with the smell of the fresh flowers that Senator Kroger has so thoughtfully placed on the desk of the late Senator Judith Anne Adams. It has been my pleasure since the time of the 2010 election to have this seat next to Judith. It is a shame that on so many occasions, especially this year, Judith has not been here.
for us all to enjoy the great camaraderie that I have shared, especially during many a question time, as we would exchange comments across the aisle and exchange our thoughts on how the politics of the day were proceeding, what was happening in the west and, of course—as we have heard from so many people—the issues Judith was so passionate about and so committed to.

I first really got to know Judith when I came to this place. I cannot speak to a condolence motion on a budget day without reflecting on the fact that it was five years ago—five budgets ago—that I entered this place. I was the Senator Dean Smith of the day, and it was a day very reminiscent of this one. Tributes flowed to my predecessor in this place, the late Jeannie Ferris. I know that Judith admired Jeannie, and I know that Jeannie admired Judith and that she would have been saddened by the fact that Judith went in such similar circumstances to those of Jeannie herself.

Getting to know Judith over those five years has been an absolute pleasure. She was, as we have heard, a direct person, a forthright person, a very matter-of-fact person. There was no messing about with Judith; you knew where you stood and you knew what the issues were, and she made sure that everybody was very clear in that sense. She was also the epitome of the adage that if you want a job done you should find a busy person to do it. Judith was a busy person and she was always getting the job done. And everyone in this place know all too well just how busy a senator she was, how busy she was in her work in this place.

As many have said, she gave so much of her time to the community affairs committee and the rural affairs committee, crisscrossing the country and listening to so many people, engaging with their issues and championing their causes. More recently when we would catch up, her work from those committees on the issue of wind farms would often become a topic of conversation relevant to my portfolio responsibilities. Judith saw that as an issue that joined her passions—her passion to ensure that issues of health care and preventive health were taken seriously and that very passionate representation she brought to regional and rural communities, as well as her desire to make sure that those communities were not adversely affected by any developments related to wind farms. She was driven by a desire to ensure that the science was applied appropriately—was developed if need be—but that those community concerns were put first and foremost.

It was not just as a senator that Judith was busy. I, like so many others, from all parties, discovered just what a busy and full life she had led when we travelled to Kojonup for her funeral service. That was where it really came through that Judith's passion in this place—her style of never stopping—was something she had every day of her life, in every act and in every step she took. We heard about Judith the horse rider and the trainer. We heard about Judith the community organiser who, if she wanted a sporting event or training activities for her two boys and they were not available in Kojonup, set about making them available—setting up the relevant organisations and ensuring that those facilities were there, not just for her two boys but for all the other children in that part of Western Australia.

Judith's was a life full of service, both to the parliament and to the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party has lost a very valued member, someone who made a tangible difference. She made a difference not just in this place and not just through her fundraising activities, hard work and service but in terms of others who have come to this place—none more so than Ken Wyatt, the member for Hasluck and the first Indigenous member of
the House of Representatives, who in many ways is here thanks to the work of Judith Adams. She worked tirelessly in that electorate to ensure Ken was elected. I recall many occasions in the run-up to the 2010 election—in party room meetings, in the chamber and elsewhere—when Judith would provide, either one-on-one to me or to the entire party room, updates on how the campaign was going. Those updates would always be littered with stories of what she had picked up on the campaign trail, knocking on doors throughout the electorate of Hasluck. Judith was renowned for her service to rural communities and to health care, as I touched on earlier. We learnt that was how she and Gordon, her late husband, came to be connected—Gordon served as a pilot for the Royal Flying Doctor Service and Judith was working as a nurse in rural health care. The passion that they both shared was obvious. And she faced her loss, in only the last couple of years, with Gordon’s passing. And there was her service to the military and her commitment to service personnel that she shared, as one who had worn the uniform of the New Zealand territorial army—and she served in Vietnam in that role.

Judith was a tough character and a real fighter. She was stoic and one never to complain, even with the challenges that she faced in her latter years. She was principled and would always stick to her guns and fight for the issues that she believed in, especially those related to rural Australia. She was a real fighter in the spirit of ANZAC—and a fighter in the spirit of rural Australia, especially for those many women in rural Australia who work and fight so hard for their communities. She was, as we have heard, a nurse, a wife, a mother, a grandmother, a farmer, a horse trainer—so many things: a senator, yes, but perhaps, as her boys Stuart and Robbie put it best at her funeral, 'Senator Mum' always. I extend my condolences to them, to her grandchildren and to her entire family. As I think fitting for a woman who gave so much in service: Judith Adams, lest we forget.

Senator XENOPHON (South Australia) (14:46): I rise of course to support the condolence motion and to add my comments to those of my colleagues. I will be brief because so much of what needs to be said has been said today. Judith Adams was an incredible woman. It saddens me that she is no longer with us, but it warms the heart to hear the tributes made to her today in this chamber. I only hope that her sons, Stuart and Robbie, her grandchildren, her family and her friends may take some comfort from the words genuinely and sincerely expressed in her honour in this chamber today.

I think Australians learnt a lot about Judith from her time in this chamber. Through her dedication and her hard work she epitomised what it was to be a good legislator, particularly through her participation in Senate committees.

So many of us today have spoken about her stoicism. I wonder whether 'stoic' is the right word for Judith, because stoicism is about being indifferent or ignoring the pain that you have and your condition. I think Judith went beyond stoicism. Not only did she ignore the pain but, in a sense, she transcended it by her sheer dedication, her hard work, her commitment and her selflessness.

The last conversation I had with Judith was on the day that President Obama was here in Canberra. There was a Senate committee hearing, chaired by Senator Heffernan, held at Old Parliament House because this building was in lock-down. It was apparent to all that Judith was in enormous pain; she was really struggling. We walked slowly and gingerly downstairs
to the dining room to have a bite to eat and had a good chat, but not once did she complain. And if you read the Hansard from that day you would not know—the questions she asked and her contribution to that Senate committee that day, were, as always, first class.

I just want to reflect and wonder whether her nursing days explain her temperament—somehow direct and warm both at the same time. It was this temperament that gained her great respect from her colleagues in this chamber over a number of years.

I also want to mention that, at her funeral, I did feel privileged—as I think Senator McEwen felt privileged—to be there and to see how much she was loved and respected not just by her colleagues but by her community and her family. There were people who travelled across the country to be a part of it—ordinary citizens who had participated in a Senate inquiry. The inquiry itself is not as important so much as the fact that they were there because they appreciated what she did. Charlie Arnott was there, as were Dr Sarah Laurie and Sam McGuinness. Charlie said this about her: 'Judith was an amazing woman who stood up for what she believed in to the very end. She put her constituents and friends ahead of her health.'

I just want to finish off by saying that Judith's incredible work ethic, her fierce tenacity, her relentless questioning and advocacy for issues and for her constituents, and her sheer dedication to public service are an inspiration to us all.

Senator CASH (Western Australia) (14:49): I, too, rise to support the condolence motion moved by my leader, Senator Abetz, and celebrate the life of Senator Judith Adams and the contribution that Judith made, not only to the people of Western Australia but to the Australian parliament.

Listening to everybody's tributes today, I am humbled to have served with Judith as a senator for Western Australia. It is apparent that, even though Judith is no longer here with us in body, she will live long in this place through the memories of her and her dedication to her work and, in particular, her service to the committee process—something we are going to remember in this place for a very long time.

Without a doubt those people who knew Judith, both here and in Western Australia, recognised that she was a strong and determined lady. It did not matter what God threw at her in life, she was someone who grabbed it with both hands and then she threw it back. She once said to me, 'Michaelia, not even the big C is going to stop me from achieving what I want to achieve in my life.' In fact, in one of the chats that I had with Judith—I often relate this story when I go to divisional functions, because I think it is an example of the type of person that Judith was, and it complements all of the stories we have heard today—she said to me: 'Michaelia, you will never believe what the doctor has gone and done—he has changed my chemo appointment to Monday. I said to him, 'Look, that's fine, but you've got to understand this: the parliament is sitting and I've got to be on the 3.30pm direct flight back to Canberra because I need to be in Canberra to ensure I'm making a contribution.' The doctor would say, 'That's okay, Judith; we can do your chemo in the morning'—and that was it: Judith would be back here on the Tuesday morning. You would bump into her at 7 am on Tuesday walking through the Senate doors. And how many of us, especially the wider public, would have known that she had been in hospital in Perth on Monday having chemo? Such was her determination that she ensured
that she was on that 3.30 pm direct flight back to Canberra on the Monday afternoon.

Listening to the wonderful tributes and anecdotes people have shared with us today, there is no doubt that Judith was an inspiration to all sides of politics. It was wonderful to see so many senators and members from the other political parties attend Judith's funeral. I thank you all. When we saw each of you walk in we were humbled to know that one of our WA senators had meant so much to you. In fact, a number of people at the funeral asked me, 'Who is that person, Michaelia?' to which I replied, 'Oh, that is Senator Rachel Siewert,' or, 'That is Senator Moore,' or, 'That is Senator McEwen,' or, 'That is Senator Xenophon.' They were so touched that you came along to pay respects to someone they in Kojonup considered to be one of their own.

I went through Judith's maiden speech in preparing my condolence. In her maiden speech in 2004, she said:

Having travelled extensively throughout rural Western Australia, I understand the problems and issues confronting such a diverse state.

And there is no doubt that she did understand them. When it came to representing the needs of rural and regional Western Australia, Judith's voice could be heard across Western Australia and, of course, it could be well and truly heard here in the national parliament.

As someone who lived in rural Western Australia, and as a former nurse, Judith was very aware of the increased burden and other challenges that faced country people who are coping with debilitating illnesses. As a committed campaigner for improved services for rural people, Judith demonstrated that she was a true advocate and champion on behalf of the disadvantaged and of those living in rural and remote Western Australia.

As we have heard, Judith and her husband, Gordon, farmed for 36 years at Kojonup, in the Great Southern region of WA. I loved that the number plates on her little Gopher read 'KO', which was a tribute to Kojonup. Judith and Gordon's two sons, Stuart and Robert, were with them on the farm. The family was very involved in the community, Judith in particular through the Country Women's Association and other local and regional clubs and associations. In fact, Judith's work was so well known in Kojonup that she was recognised as the Kojonup Lions Citizen of the Year in 1995.

It was very fitting that her memorial service was held in the Kojonup town hall. The memorial service was a typical country service, right down to the fact that there was an announcement that the organ was playing up on the day and if it blew up could we all just remain seated, and also for the fact that the hall was so hot that you sat there the whole time fanning yourself! I was laughing to myself through the funeral that it is exactly what Judith would have wanted it to be. She would have been humbled by the many senators and members who attended the service, and in particular those who came in from the eastern states.

Without a doubt, Judith was a tireless advocate for those who had suffered from breast cancer. Whenever the need arose or the opportunity presented itself, she put her efforts into improving awareness of and the services for women experiencing not only this type of cancer but also ovarian cancer and bowel cancer. Her experiences both as a nurse and as a breast cancer sufferer gave her a real understanding of the challenges that cancer sufferers face. This was one of the factors that motivated her in all of her work.

Judith had a very long history in the Liberal Party in Western Australia, including being president of the O'Connor division.
Senator Pratt referred to the fact that Judith had wanted to attend the O'Connor division conference, which was being held in Albany on 31 March. It was slightly ironic that that was the day of her passing. But what was so beautiful about that morning was that we were all gathered there in Albany when the President of the Liberal Party stood and made the announcement that Judith had passed away earlier that morning. It was beautiful because the O'Connor division was Judith's family. It was almost like she knew. She was giving them a message that everything would be okay. They were all together on that morning and were able to provide themselves and her Senate colleagues, and Dean Smith as well, with the comfort that we all needed.

Today in the Senate we recognise that Judith achieved much in her lifetime. For that, we celebrate her life. May she rest in peace.

Senator EGGLESTON (Western Australia) (14:57): Judith Adams. The images that spring to my mind when I think of Judith are a hard worker, a person who was enthusiastic about all she did, a good colleague and friend and a very determined person who would see things through to the end no matter what adversities or difficulties she faced.

Judith had some north-west connections, which I learnt about only recently. She had worked as an emergency nursing service nurse in the north-west of WA. In fact she met her husband, who was an RFDS pilot at Meekatharra, in the north-west. Meekatharra is in the mid-west and was an RFDS patient transfer point for patients coming down from places like Broome, Port Hedland and Karratha. A crew would come up to Perth and swap aircraft and take the patient on to Perth while the north-west crews went back to their home bases.

Her husband, Gordon, was a farmer from Kojonup. He had leased out his farm while he spent some time as an RFDS pilot in the north-west. After they were married they went back to the Great Southern wheat belt town of Kojonup, where, as we all know, Judith became very heavily involved in community affairs. As we heard at her funeral, her many interests—I thought rather surprisingly—included horseracing, which is one that I would not have picked for Judith. But nevertheless, she was a horse breeder and spent a lot of time in that endeavour.

Health services were a very important focus of Judith's life. She was for several years on the Perth metropolitan hospitals board and she quite frequently came to my office to discuss health issues, especially regional health services as well as women's health issues. As has been said by others today, it was an important interest to her.

Judith was active in the Liberal Party and was president of the O'Connor division. In due course she became a senator for Western Australia, fulfilling two roles: that of a farming senator on our Senate team and also representing women's interests. Her bravery in facing up to difficult issues was demonstrated when as divisional president of O'Connor she suggested to Wilson Tuckey that perhaps he should consider a succession plan. I am not sure that Wilson was very amenable to that but nevertheless Judith had the courage to raise it with him. One would have hoped it made him think that perhaps it was time for him to look at a successor, but as we all know he soldiered on to the end and in fact lost his seat, which was probably the best way for Wilson to end his term in parliament, dying in the trenches fighting for his beliefs.

As has been said, Judith was a tireless worker on the many committees she was involved in, travelling all over Australia. Her connection with and respect for the military
surprised me. It has been said already that she had served in the New Zealand territorial army in Vietnam and she retained the greatest respect for the military, not only the Army but also the Navy, in her years since she was in Vietnam.

Her strength in the great debate over the single-desk issue very much contributed to the changes which occurred and which were alluded to by Wilson Tuckey in his funeral eulogy. Changing from a single desk for wheat marketing was a major issue in rural politics, farming politics, in Western Australia and Judith was one of the leaders of the push to change from that system. Now with a different system I think most wheat farmers would agree that it was a good thing to have done.

I believe Judith showed great strength and fortitude in facing the challenges of her illness and I greatly admired her for this. I visited her in Royal Perth Hospital and I was deeply touched by her great determination to fight on and overcome her illness even though as a medical professional and sometime horseracer she must have known that the odds were not good. Judith rang me a week before she died, which I thought was a privileged call. At that time I think she knew that her time was short, and she faced her last week with the stoicism and bravery with which she had faced her whole illness.

Judith was an extraordinary person and she will be remembered not only in Western Australia but, as we have heard today, across Australia for the great work she has done in the committee system in the Senate. For her sons, Stuart and Robbie, her passing must leave a big space in their lives. And it is not only in their lives that a great space has been left, because she leaves a great space in the life of the Senate as well. May she rest in peace.

Senator FAULKNER (New South Wales) (15:04): I too speak in support of this motion of condolence on the death of Senator Judith Adams. A condolence motion for a serving senator is, thankfully, a rare event in this chamber. I certainly understand that for those who shared a friendship or party allegiance or worked closely with Judith Adams this debate is a particularly difficult one. But this afternoon, as a former Minister for Defence, I wanted to acknowledge, as many speakers have in this condolence debate, Judith Adams's genuine interest in defence issues and her strong support for Australian Defence Force personnel.

One example I recall of Judith's involvement with Defence was the warm friendship she developed with the officers and crew of HMAS Arunta which stemmed from an official visit to the ship at Albany on Anzac Day 2009. A few months later Judith was a guest on board Arunta while the ship was conducting trials in Cockburn Sound. Judith had embarked on the ship's rigid hull inflatable boat—inevitably in Defence there is an acronym for that, and it is RHIB—and she had done so to witness the operations at closer hand. This was by no means her first experience on one of the Navy's RHIBs but on this occasion while the RHIB was operating in the vicinity of Arunta Judith fell heavily on the deck and hurt her arm. By the time as defence minister I was formally briefed about the incident it was clear in fact that Judith had broken her arm and was having a short stay in Rockingham Hospital. I gave her a call just to see how she was going, and I must say that she seemed very, very perplexed, if not amazed, that the minister would have been told about something she thought was such a minor mishap. But I was able to inform her that this was standard operating procedure in Defence
and that of course defence people were all concerned about her wellbeing.

Needless to say, Judith was undeterred by all that. I am very pleased to say, as I think senators are well aware, that for the remainder of her life she maintained a close and genuine relationship with Defence and its people, and was actively involved in defence issues. It also goes without saying that Defence finds such interest and commitment from parliamentarians gratifying.

All this and so many more of Judith's Senate responsibilities were being fulfilled as she fought a very personal battle against cancer. We have heard today how she fought that battle with dignity and courage to the end. I join with other colleagues in expressing my sincere condolences to Judith Adams's family, her friends and her colleagues. The Senate is poorer for her passing.

**Senator BACK** (Western Australia) (15:09): It is my privilege to rise to join in support of the motion by my leader, Senator Abetz, in honouring the life of Senator Judith Adams and to celebrate that life. I first came into serious contact with Senator Adams when I had the opportunity to put my name forward when then Senator Chris Ellison decided that he would retire from the Senate. I went to see Judith, and it was like going to see the headmistress. She was quizzing me on what sorts of attributes I had. When she learned I was a veterinarian she was fairly happy with that, and then when she learnt that I had a fairly strong rural background she was all right. It was really only at her funeral, when I learnt that she had been a racehorse trainer, that I came to understand why she was so intensely interested in the fact that I had been the WA Turf Club's veterinary consultant. In provincial racing days I had known Judith as an administrator in the racing industry in that way; I never knew that she in fact had been a trainer.

One of the interesting things, Mr President—and I can say this to you because you are not one—is that she said to me, 'What are people saying to you?' and I said, 'Well, because Senator Ellison is a lawyer, there's a perception that he has to be replaced by a lawyer,' which caused her, of course, to get one of her staff members in and to go through the list of Senate colleagues who were lawyers. Learning that particular number, she said to me, 'Chris, I actually don't believe that we do need yet another lawyer.' To this day, I have no knowledge of whether she supported me or she did not.

It was also on that occasion that she informed me so warmly of the role of the relationship between the Australian Defence Force and the parliament, and I think almost on day one I was signed up to a parliamentary program to go to NORFORCE. She remained, as we all know, very, very keen on that relationship.

It is unfortunate that you have to go to somebody's funeral to learn more about a person with whom you have spent so much time, but all of us I think were enriched by the stories of her brother-in-law, Gordon's brother; of her two sons; and, of course, of Wilson Tuckey. It is a shame—no, Senator Nash is back here now. At one stage in his proceedings, Wilson was reflecting on some of Judith's passions and one of them, of course, was the abolition of the single desk. I felt compelled to lean forward to Senator Nash and tell her that she actually did not have a right of reply at Judith's service to rebut whatever Wilson was saying! But, as others have said, it was a day of great celebration in a town that she called her own.

We all know her background from New Zealand in the territorial army of New Zealand, meeting Gordon. When Gordon
passed away, as others have said, she was not with him. The circumstances were, as somebody has already mentioned, that it was the day that they were to move into their new home in Gidgegannup, having sold the farm in Kojonup. She was not able to contact Gordon. She got one of her staff to pop around to her home to see that he was okay, and of course he had passed away. I did not know Ruth Webber, but Judith was overcome by the number of people who travelled to WA and down to Kojonup on that occasion for Gordon's funeral, and she mentioned then Senator Webber for her courtesy in so doing. I will come back in a few moments to reflect on others who came to Judith's funeral.

I happened to be sitting with Judith on a Senate inquiry relating to aircraft noise. We were all there in Perth, and there was great discussion about noise to the east of the city. Judith was absolutely giving it—as Senator Siewert has said she did, on matters about which she was passionate—to the chief executive of Airservices Australia, whereupon they brought out a great big map. On the map, as Senator Fawcett would understand far better than I, were all the trajectories of the arrivals and departures of aircraft coming into Perth Airport. For those of you non-Western Australians, you need to know that Gidgegannup is just to the north-east of the airport. There were three intersecting lines upon which aircraft could either arrive or depart, and you would not believe it: the Airservices chief executive looked at me, and I said, 'Yes, you've managed to get the spot directly above Senator Adams's home,' which gave him that opportunity.

I wish to reflect finally, if I may, on two areas: that of Judith's passion as the divisional president for O'Connor and for her role in the Senate, and her great capacity for and interest in doorknocking. Judith always said that doorknocking is what gets you across the line. I know one of her moments of great pride. She was asked to assist Ken Wyatt in his quest for the seat of Hasluck, which the Leader of the Government in the Senate, Senator Evans, has already referred to. Ken learnt what it was to doorknock with Judith. I do not know how many pairs of shoes she must have worn out but those of us who knew her know that this was at a time when she actually could not feel her feet as a result of the treatment she was receiving.

It was a moment of enormous pride for all of us when we attended in the other place the first speech of Ken Wyatt as the first Aboriginal man in the House of Representatives and, so proudly, as the member for Hasluck. I make the observation—and I believe he will because he is an outstanding person—that if he has a far vision into the future it will be because he stood on the shoulders of Senator Judith Adams. I take nothing away from him in that result. That stands as testament.

Mr President, I finish by acknowledging your presence, that of the leader Senator Evans, Senator McEwen, Senator Siewert, Senator Nash representing the Nationals, Senator Xenophon, so many from our side including our leader, and Senator Macdonald who came down from North Queensland. I think every state of Australia was represented and that gave those of us from Western Australia a great degree of pride. I know it would have given Stuart and Robert and Gordon's family a great degree of satisfaction that she was so highly regarded in this place. I join Senator Faulkner in his comment that this place is poorer for her leaving. May she rest in peace.

Senator BOSWELL (Queensland) (15:16): I rise today to pay my respects and to give tribute to Senator Judith Adams. Like all my colleagues, I watched her courageous
struggle with admiration. To her Senate colleagues Judith was an absolute model of stoicism in the face of adversity and until the end of her brave battle with cancer, actively attended to her work as a senator for Western Australia following her election in 2004.

A trained nurse, midwife, health consultant, Judith was a passionate advocate for women's health, particularly in rural and remote areas. This is a subject that as a National Party senator I see as being of great importance and I applaud Senator Adams for pursuing this course. She also showed bravery and commitment to her country when she joined the nursing corps in the New Zealand army and served as a nurse in the Vietnam War. Her dedication to her country and caring instincts for people would later serve her well in her career as a senator.

Her service in the Senate could only be described as intensely dedicated and committed. Even in the last few weeks she was still ringing her staff and constituents, making sure that her office was election ready. This was the kind of dogged determination she showed as a senator. We should all aspire to have the same kind of drive and care for the people we represent. The Senate is a tough place at the best of times, however Senator Adams endured all the usual pressure that this office holds and still managed to cope with a destructive illness.

Her example should remind senators and members of parliament how seriously we must take our jobs, about how we can think we have done all that we can to look down and strive to do more. It is also a sobering reminder of how little time we have to achieve. She reminded us that as hard as we may think our job is, there are always people out there who have it tougher and need us to speak up on their behalf. Senator Adams knew this and never waivered in her service to the Australian people. If we give up when it gets a little too much for us then we are doing ourselves and our constituents a disservice and we are ignoring the legacy of the people such as Senator Adams, who endured so much and still gave more.

As tragic and as sad as Senator Adams's passing is, her family and friends and colleagues should be proud of the example she has set and the work she has done. She was an inspiration to all of us. I do not think there is anyone in this chamber who thinks she had anything left to prove or anything left to give. She has truly set the benchmark for us and all who follow her. I thank her for that and extend my condolences to her family and her extended family.

Senator CROSSIN (Northern Territory) (15:19): I rise this afternoon to also support the condolence motion moved by Senator Abetz and be part of this contribution today. People might notice that I do not often stand up in this chamber and speak about senators who have departed on their retirement or voluntarily left. I do not think I contributed either to the condolence motion when Jeannie Ferris died. But I do feel compelled to say a few words today.

I guess in my life there are Liberals and there are Liberals. I know the people opposite me will probably say there are Labor Party people and there are Labor Party people. For me, Judith was a colleague more than a political opponent. She was someone who truly commanded the respect of those who worked with her. I did not work with Judith as much as people like Senator Siewert of Senator Moore did. I was not a permanent member of the Standing Committee on Community Affairs but I did have occasion to work with her on some opportunities and on some inquiries—as Senator Scullion said, the Select Committee on Regional and Remote Indigenous Affairs—on issues that she cared about deeply.
Communities—as well as her participation in the petrol sniffing inquiry.

The thing that struck me about Judith was that when it came to Indigenous people, she got it. She understood and appreciated where they were at because she had worked in rural and remote communities and Indigenous communities. I think what people opposite have said about her nursing background is true. It gave her a different perspective about challenges facing Indigenous people. I was certainly convinced that she was passionate about rural and regional Western Australia; you could see that in all of the work that she did.

One of the reasons I wanted to stand up this afternoon was to relate to people what is perhaps a very rare and strange occurrence. Senator Moore, who is beside me, was at my place that afternoon, as was Mark Furner. Members of the community affairs committee were coming through Darwin, and I think you had been on the road for quite a while, although I do not quite remember which inquiry it was. As a warm and friendly gesture, I offered a home-cooked meal at my place on the Sunday night and extended that invitation to not only my Labor colleagues but also Judith Adams. She was a bit surprised, of course, when I rang her and said: 'You're pulling into Darwin at about four on Sunday. There are plenty of great restaurants in Darwin—or I'm offering a lamb roast.' She said, 'Well, there's no choice, really! What time?'

I do remember that evening. The four of us sat around and chatted about lots of things but not politics. I tell that story because, on the day that I heard of her passing, I remembered that night and how she just loved sitting around the kitchen table and how she had, I think, maybe three helpings of meat and vegies—and commented on my gravy! She actually said it was probably better than she made, which was astounding, because she was actually a farm woman and I thought they could cook everything. I also remember thinking to myself that Judith's first love was probably her family and that this was not the first or last time she would sit around the dining-room table having a lamb roast and chatting about everything under the sun except politics.

So what I saw that night was another woman politician who appreciated a home-cooked meal, a mother and someone who was passionate about Western Australia and rural and remote people; I did not see a Liberal political opponent at my kitchen table. That is what I remember about Judith, and that is what I want the people opposite to remember about Judith. I know, if this was being broadcast, some people would be listening to this thinking, 'How bizarre! Labor senators having a meal at home with Liberal senators?' But it was never like that. It was about Senate colleagues extending a friendly invitation to have a home-cooked meal when you very rarely get that chance. I think it was probably one of the most enjoyable nights a number of us have had, when I reflect on it.

The day she died, I thought of a number of things. I thought about the loss of Judith to Western Australia and to her constituents, but I also thought about you, my colleagues opposite, and what a tremendous loss it is to have one of your very close workers depart in such a sad way. I remember, Senator Kroger, us having a conversation in the sittings earlier this year, when a lot of us knew that Judith was very sick but hoped against hope that she would be back. So I was a bit shocked to hear the news.

I also want to pass on my condolences to her staff. How incredibly hard it must have been to keep her office going, knowing she was so sick, and how tragically sad it must
have been to pack up her office after she departed. I never met her staff, I am not familiar with them, but I can certainly empathise with them about what they had to go through.

There are three other things I want to say in closing. The day she died, I tweeted the fact that I was sad that she had passed on. I want people in this chamber to know that quite a few people, a number of whom actually worked in this building, replied to my tweet and made comments about what a wonderful woman she was. Former senator Natasha Stott-Despoja emailed a number of us this afternoon—Carol Brown picked up her email in her contribution—and she wanted us to pass on her condolences too. I know she would want to be part of this contribution. So that is another contribution out there.

I have an email here from Jane Singleton, who is the former CEO of the Australian Reproductive Health Alliance. This is what she had to say, back on 3 April:

I wanted it to be known as a part of the remembrances of her, the brave and effective role she played in the ru486 campaign—of which she was one of the leaders. She goes on:

You will remember that Get Up did a petition, but in fact it was a ‘PR’ petition, effective but not able to be tabled in the Parliament.

The family planning organisations in each state under the umbrella of SHFPA—that is, the Sexual Health and Family Planning Association—did their own.

I was the one of those who worked with the organisations and coordinated the campaign for SHFPA whilst I was working for Family Planning NSW.

We created a web site all but overnight which met all the requirements of a petition to be tabled in the Australian Parliament

We got many thousands of signatories.

It was Judith who tabled it in the Senate.

This action greatly improved the lives of Australian women and their families. Importantly also it created a precedent.

It is a precedent that people may not remember, but it is important to remember it today. As Ms Singleton says:

It was the first electronic petition to be tabled in the Australian Parliament. and a great service to democratic process.

With that I say: vale, Judith. Lest we forget. You were a wonderful woman and a great colleague; thank you. My condolences to her family and her colleagues.

Senator McKENZIE (Victoria) (15:28):

I also rise to support the condolence motion to recognise the passing of an extraordinary Australian woman, Senator Judith Adams. Today we are celebrating the life of a woman whom I wish I had had more time to get to know. She was only 68. She was special and she is irreplaceable. I would have liked to have attended her funeral service in WA, where Senator Nash represented the Nationals. At this time of sorrow, our hearts go out to those who love her, particularly her family: her sons, Stuart and Robert, and their respective partners, Anne and Tammy; and her grandchildren, Taylor and Maelle, who have a great role model in this grandmother of theirs. I will remember her with fondness, respect and great admiration. Many fine sentiments have been expressed about Senator Adams today and I am sure more will follow my brief contribution.

I have known Judith only since July 2011 but she made a significant impact on me. As a way of demonstrating that, I will tell you a little story. As part of the Women in Federal Parliament initiative, a permanent exhibition near the entrance on the first floor, each female parliamentarian submits a photo of themselves to display there. As a newly
elected senator, I was sent the information and a sample of relaxed natural photos, which is what they were looking for, and asked could I provide one. They sent a range of the photos of other female senators. Everyone was looking relaxed and natural, some a little more than others and some had clearly just pulled a photo out of their electorate portfolio. Flicking through them as I sat at my little kitchen table in Leongatha in South Gippsland, probably in a pair of jeans and a T-shirt, the picture I liked the best was of a woman riding on a quad bike with her working dogs beside her. Her clothes were farm wear and she was smiling straight down the barrel of the camera. The bike was moving—it was an action shot. It really appealed to me. I thought, 'If there are people like this woman in this place, I think I'm going to be okay.' There was a steely determination behind that smile of somebody who knows the reality of living on the land with and against the environment and the elements. I was impressed with the authenticity of this woman senator in the photo. She was proud of being a country woman. She was happy for that photo to go up on permanent display in the Australian parliament. I did not know her name. It was not until a couple of months ago that I worked out that that woman was Senator Judith Adams.

Once I got here, I was appointed to the Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs, where I met a lovely woman with beautiful suits, magnificent suits of such vibrant colours in a place where—let's face it—it is black or red, or grey if you are on the trend upward. She had fantastic and colourful suits. She was softly spoken and she had a fierce passion for regional Australia, particularly Western Australia. Obviously, as a National, that is a passion I share. She was also quietly furious about waste in spending. She was very concerned about Indigenous issues and she displayed an impressive and intricate knowledge of the health portfolio and which bureaucrat was which in Senate estimates processes.

Throughout all those hearings, I thought she was recovering; I did not know that she was so ill. She had asked me to assist with budget estimates—all she said was that she had been unable to organise it this time—and she gave me lots of gentle advice around the process. A meeting took place in her office. It was the first time I had been in her office but I remember it was just lovely—full of natural light and flowers. I really miss that, being inside so much these days. Her office really impressed me.

She was patient and kind at the same time as being strong and brave. The woman in the photo who so impressed me, the woman with a steely determination to fight injustice, was the same woman who tried to fight cancer—Judith Adams. I recently learnt that Judith had worked as a nursing sister in the New Zealand territorial army and, at the age of 23, during the Vietnam War she worked with the medical team other people have mentioned. That particular experience must have shaped her. It gave her the ability to deal with loss and to manage life, as it reveals itself, in a practical and matter of fact way. War in Vietnam would have influenced how she managed her own illness and dealt with her own loss. Judith chose to focus on her fierce and ferocious advocacy of rural Australia. She also chose to keep the focus on the government and keeping the bureaucracy accountable through estimates. She was always focused on the outcome and keen to find a bipartisan solution if one presented itself.

I did not know her for long but her contribution to the Senate, to the Standing Committee on Community Affairs and to my growing understanding of work here was
significant. I shall miss her colour, her professionalism and her strength but most of all her reality checks in the middle of committee hearings. So very, very regional Australian—vale Judith.

Senator FIFIELD (Victoria—Manager of Opposition Business in the Senate) (15:35): Judith Adams was one of those people you appreciated more and more as time passed. There are many people for whom familiarity diminishes your view of them. Judith certainly was not one of those. She had a depth and a breadth and also an underappreciated mischievousness, and cheekiness as well. By the time she entered the Senate she already had a lifetime of achievement with the New Zealand territorial army, as a nurse, and as a mother, a pastoralist, a horse breeder and a horse trainer. Few have brought more life experience to this place than Judith, which is probably why she was such a great judge of character. She could sum up people pretty quickly and no-one could hide from Judith the stuff of which they were made.

She was possessed of a formidable work ethic, but she was also very wise. That wisdom found great expression through the Community Affairs Committee and through her role as whip. She could always be relied upon. That wisdom and the pastoral interest she took in others made her a favourite among coalition staff. Many of our staff were especially fond of her, and there is much sadness amongst the ranks of coalition staff about Judith's passing.

We are all aware of one of her great passions, which was the Australian Defence Force and its service personnel. This was brought home to me again on Anzac Day this year. I was attending a ceremony in Dandenong and a senior ADF officer came up to me and asked whether I served in the Senate. I said I did, and he said, 'You must know my great mate Judith Adams'. This was a couple of weeks after Judith's funeral, and so I said, 'I do, but I am sorry to tell you that Judith died very recently'. This Defence Force officer was genuinely taken aback. He had not heard the news. The first thing he said was, 'Please tell me that there was a formal ADF representation at the funeral', and I was able to assure him that there was and that the ADF was very well represented. That instance showed the impact that Judith had had on the ADF and its personnel. She was seen as one of them and she was held in very high regard by them.

It was a great privilege to attend Judith's memorial service. It was a terrific celebration of a great life. It is appropriate that we do pause for a moment to acknowledge Judith's staff, the most visible of whom in this place was Trish. All of our staff show to us a commitment, both personal and professional, that goes beyond that which you find in most other occupations. Judith's staff went even further—and they did so willingly. They too have lost a friend, and they have lost someone that they cared for very much. Those of us who have lost parents would all understand that, no matter what age our parents are, when they die it is always too early. Judith's sons, Stuart and Robert, are experiencing that at the moment, but they should be very proud of their mum. She was a great woman. I will miss her, as will all her colleagues.

Senator CORMANN (Western Australia) (15:40): Judith Adams was a wonderful person who cared, who worked hard and who was always determined to change things for the better, particularly for people in rural and regional areas. Senator Judith Adams was a valued friend and respected colleague who is sadly missed by all of us who knew her. I first met Judith back in 2000 when she was a state candidate in Wagin. Wagin was then and still is deep inside National Party...
It is fair to say that Judith engaged in the campaign with characteristic vigour, and she of course engaged then, as she did subsequently, in a battle of ideas with the National Party, with the Labor Party, with the Greens and of course on occasion inside the Liberal Party too. Judith had very strong and very clear views and she was never frightened to express them and pursue them. When she pursued an argument, when she pursued a policy issue or when she engaged in a battle of ideas she did it in a way that developed at the same time great friendships, great relationships. The presence of so many colleagues at her funeral in Kojonup was testament to the high regard in which she was held by her colleagues right across the Senate.

The last time I met Judith was just before Christmas, when she had a Christmas function in her office for her friends and supporters. She had already been in hospital for some time, and she came back that afternoon because she was not going to miss out on her Christmas function; she was not going to let down the people who had made the effort to attend. She came from her hospital bed to the function, and then she went straight back to hospital. That says something about her determination and about her endearing stubbornness in the face of adversity.

Many very kind and very appropriate words have been spoken about Judith by colleagues around the chamber—words like 'tenacious', 'hard-working' and 'courageous'. I certainly agree with all of them. 'Courageous' definitely sums up Judith. She never took the easy choices or the safest road; she never took a step back. She of course was courageous long before she joined us here in the Senate. She was courageous when, as a young woman, she served as a nurse in the New Zealand territorial army, with service in Vietnam in 1967, and then on coming to Western Australia she joined the Emergency Nursing Service, beginning a long association with the bush and healthcare needs of rural Western Australia—which of course is the role that brought her into contact with the Royal Flying Doctor Service, which is where she met her future husband, Gordon. Judith and Gordon took the decision to go farming in Kojonup in the Great Southern area of Western Australia, where they farmed for 40 years and raised two sons, Stuart and Robert.

As we all know, farming is a tough game and it is a great breeding ground for tenacious politicians. Judith was one of the most tenacious there was. Of course in recent times there have been a number of policy battles at a federal level and she has been right on the front line. When the Liberal Party had a discussion a few years ago about our position on emissions trading and carbon taxes, you name it, Judith Adams was at the forefront, taking a stand. In fact, she stepped down for a period as the senior Deputy Opposition Whip in the pursuit of her convictions on that issue. We all know how she pursued her view that all wheat farmers should be able to sell their wheat according to their own wishes rather than be forced by government regulation into a single-desk arrangement. She pursued that not just in opposition but as a relatively new senator in the Howard government. At some point, Wilson Tuckey and Senator Judith Adams in fact were putting together a private member's bill to deregulate wheat export marketing arrangements in Australia. That was part of a long campaign which ultimately led to the outcome that Judith and Wilson had been pursuing. It was a controversial issue inside and outside the coalition and it is to Judith's everlasting credit that, in the circumstances and in the context of a sometimes pretty robust campaign against her position, she
stuck to her guns and ultimately achieved policy and political success.

However, for all her many political achievements, Judith was at her most courageous in her battle against breast cancer, particularly over the last 12 months. As a breast cancer survivor when she was elected to the Senate, Judith used that experience to inform her Senate committee work and to help groups like the BreastScreen WA advisory committee and various other associations. It was noticeable at Judith's memorial in Kojonup just how many groups and associations from the healthcare and aged-care sector were represented. Both before her election and as a senator she pursued a range of policy issues such as the Patient Assisted Travel Scheme, issues around the appropriate provision of aged-care services—in particular for people in rural and regional Australia—and so on.

It was heart-warming to see the number of colleagues who came all the way to Kojonup for her funeral. On our side, our leader, our deputy leader and our leader in the Senate, Senator Abetz, attended, but there were people there from all sides of parliament—the President and the Leader of the Government in the Senate, for example. It was really heart-warming to see how many people from right across the chamber and from right across the political divide made a very special effort to be there to celebrate Judith's life and to provide support and comfort to her family.

Judith was stoic and professional in the face of great personal hardship. She was a proud senator for Western Australia and a proud Liberal. If we look back at her maiden speech, we see the strong themes she carried with her throughout her time in the Senate—rural health and aged care, salinity, border control and biosecurity issues in the north-west of WA, Indigenous welfare and communications infrastructure in the bush. These issues are just as topical today across the wheat belt of WA and Australian rural communities more widely as they were when Judith raised them back in 2005.

We all miss Judith. My condolences go to her sons, Stuart and Robert, her grandchildren and her extended family. Rest in peace, Judith Adams.

Senator BUSHBY (Tasmania—Deputy Opposition Whip in the Senate) (15:48): I rise also to support the motion of condolence regarding Senator Judith Adams. It was with great sadness that I read the text message I received just before Easter from Senator Mathias Cormann, whom I have the pleasure to follow on this motion, informing me that my good friend and colleague Senator Judith Adams had passed away.

Judith had been ill for many years. This was a fact that we all knew. But, because she had been fighting that illness so strongly, so stoically, so heroically, I and possibly many others had come to expect her by our side in this place, regardless of the illness she had been battling for so long. As such, when she took a turn for the worse before Christmas, I fully hoped that she would again soon be joining us back here just as she had when she had recovered from complications from her illness on earlier occasions. But, unfortunately for Judith, for her family, for the Liberal Party, for the people of Western Australia and for the people of Australia, this was not to be the case this time.

Judith and I worked most closely when I joined her as a deputy opposition whip in this place. Initially, I sat next to her in the chamber and we worked closely, helping manage the opposition in this place together with the then Chief Opposition Whip and Manager of Opposition Business, Senator Stephen Parry, who is here on my right, and
later with the current Chief Opposition Whip, Senator Helen Kroger. Senator Adams was a delight to work with in that role and was a tower of strength to both chief whips. She taught me a lot about the role of a whip and the management of the chamber.

As important as the role we played as deputy whips was, however, working so closely with Judith exposed me to one key characteristic which I will forever admire and remember her for—and that is the manner in which she quietly and tenaciously bore the great discomfort and pain which was almost constantly with her as a result of her illness or from its treatment. Although on the whole she disguised this well, she at times let down her guard and the pain and discomfort were apparent. Sitting next to her, I probably had a better opportunity to witness that than most people. But not once did I hear a complaint and not once did she ask for special treatment or deference because of her illness. She just wanted to get on with the job for which she was elected, a job which I believe she did in an exemplary fashion. Others have spoken of her work ethic, her passion for health issues, particularly those affecting women and rural and regional Australians, and her great dedication to committee work. I echo those comments.

I was also, as many in this place have noted, fortunate enough to attend her memorial service in Western Australia and was heartened by the size of the crowd. The hall that it was held in was large and yet people were standing around the sides—all the seats were taken. I think there were even people outside the entrance who were trying to listen from there. The respect that was shown for Judith by the local community and by the people who had travelled from all across Western Australia and all across Australia to pay their respects to her was a real testament to the lady, to the woman, to her as a senator, to her as a local community leader and to her as a member of her family. The other key point that I would just like to remember and note here about Judith was this. We have heard today that she was a warrior for what she believed in. She certainly was. One of the key aspects on which I worked very closely with her was near the end of 2009 when the CPRS debate was occurring and a number of us in this place had determined that we were going to cross the floor and vote against the position that we as a party had taken, and Judith and I were two of those who had determined that we were going to do that, because Judith felt very strongly that that piece of legislation that was before this place then was not the right thing for the people that she represented. I know there are varying views on that, but it just highlights her strength of view: when she formed a view that is what she stuck to, and she went all out to actually put that into place.

She and I put together a joint media release and offered to the party room that we would resign our positions as the deputy opposition whips because, having had a discussion, we both felt that it was inappropriate for us to be responsible, as part of the leadership team, for delivering that which the party room had decided when we were going to be voting against that. So we both formed that view, and went to the party room and made that offer. As things transpired, that offer never needed to be acted upon, and we all know the events of those days. But that just highlights to me how she was a warrior for what she believed in. She had formed that view and very passionately then pursued the outcome that she thought was the right one.

She was also a true compassionate Liberal. She was totally trustworthy and loyal to those around her, and a perfect example to me of what a senator in this place
should be. I will miss her company and her advice, and I wish the very best to her family. May she rest in peace.

Senator IAN MACDONALD (Queensland) (15:54): It is difficult to add anything further to the very fine words that have been expressed today in this Senate by Senator Abetz and Senator Evans, Senator Siewert and Senator Joyce, and, indeed, by all of my Senate colleagues, about a very fine person, our dear friend and Senate colleague, Senator Judith Adams. I extend again my condolences to Stuart and Robert and to Judith's extended family on her passing.

It was an honour and, indeed, an uplifting experience for me to attend Judith's funeral service in Kojonup, along with most of her Senate colleagues, and anyone who was anyone in the Liberal Party, including the federal leader and deputy leader, the Western Australian Premier and the state president of the party. It was, as others have said, a magnificent show of respect for someone we all loved.

I want, in passing, to express my thanks to Judith's family, and to the Kojonup council and community for facilitating the attendance of so many friends and colleagues from all over Australia at her final farewell. I also want to mention in that regard David Johnston and his office for their help in getting many of us from afar from Perth to Kojonup—not an easy task. As others have so well recounted, you know the impact that Judith had on people when 'Ironbar' Wilson Tuckey was reduced to emotion in his wonderful eulogy to his friend and co-conspirator—and I emphasise 'co-conspirator'—in Western Australia.

My great admiration for Judith was earned by the character, determination and courage that others have so eloquently described. But my special association with Judith resulted from our shared passion for regional and remote communities and for the Liberal Party and its role in country Australia. Judith was living proof that the Liberals were the legitimate party of rural Australians. I might say, in that regard, that, curiously, the last funeral I attended in Western Australia—indeed, the only other funeral I have attended there—was that of Senator John Panizza. He was also, at the time, our whip, also a passionate advocate for rural and regional Australia, and, like Judith, a person who had not been born in Australia but who had come here and, through farming and other enterprises, had become a very successful Australian. That is rather coincidental, and at Judith's funeral I was reminded of Senator John Panizza.

It was one of Judith's great achievements, and one that she was very proud of, that the Liberal Party had achieved in rural Western Australia the success that it actually had over many years. Her work for people who do not live in the capital cities is legend for all of us who know, but I do not think it will ever be fully appreciated by the many country Australians who Judith had helped during her pre-Senate life and had continued to help since her time in the Senate.

Judith was a dear friend, a loyal colleague and a great help to me in many of the difficult issues that have come before this parliament. On anything to do with health or farming or rural matters I would always dutifully take the word of the relevant minister or shadow minister, but then I would go and check it with Judith for common sense and accuracy, and it was Judith who was able to explain to me and to guide me on the difficult issues of stem cell and RU486 matters that troubled this parliament and this chamber many years ago.

My small role in the Defence portfolio these days allows me to associate with many
a senior and, indeed, junior Army, Navy and Air Force officers, and all of them you speak to knew and respected Judith. She was a great and learned supporter of the men and women who comprise Australia's Defence forces. I was delighted that the respect that Judith showed to them was reciprocated by the military with the last post and the ode at her farewell service. I know that our Defence personnel would want to be associated with the condolence motion before the chair. Before I conclude, I would also like to say that I know that Senator Sue Boyce, my Queensland colleague who unfortunately is not here today, would also want to be associated with all of the very fine words that have been spoken about Senator Judith Adams today. Sue and Judith shared many common issues and I know that Sue, along with the rest of us, will miss her greatly. Rest in peace, Judith Adams.

Senator RYAN (Victoria) (15:59): I rise to support the motion moved by Senator Abetz which the government so graciously allowed him to move on behalf of the Senate today, and particularly on behalf of the members of the Liberal Party. It is often said that we learn too much about our friends, and even occasionally our family, at their funerals. Despite all the time that we spend together in this place, I fear it is even more true here because, as others have commented, our experience at the magnificent service for Judith Adams did teach us a few things. But, as we learned from Judith, nothing should surprise us because of the incredible life experience that she brought to this place.

I do not plan to repeat the comments made by so many people before me in the chamber today, other than to stand behind them and state that I agree with them. I would like to outline what made Judith unique—unique to me in the service I have had with her in this place since July 2008 and, I think, to all of us. As others have commented, Judith was a person of extraordinary strength, courage, tenacity and determination. She was also a person of extraordinary compassion and, indeed in my experience, politeness at all times no matter what the pressure and no matter what the situation. For those who took Judith's politeness or good manner for a lack of determination, woe to them as they learnt very quickly that they should not make that mistake. They learnt very quickly that Judith was indeed a person who was here for a purpose and who would in no way pull back from fighting for the causes she believed in. She brought her life experience to this place and we, the people she represented and Australia are better for it. As we have heard, she was tireless in her political efforts for her community, for the Liberal Party and, as so many others have spoken about, particularly for the communities she represented directly and in which she lived.

I would like to talk about what I think made Judith uniquely effective as a politician, a senator and an advocate. As well as being a profoundly decent person in whom one could always trust, she had an extraordinary empathy with people. Judith had an extraordinary ability to connect with the people she was talking to and representing, as we have heard from so many stories and anecdotes today. She had an insight into what made people tick and what mattered to them and into why they were doing what they were doing. At a personal level, last year when I had a serious but temporary illness in my own family, Judith constantly checked in on me with the occasional phone call and email, and a note wishing me best wishes, for a number of weeks. Back in this place, she would pop round just to check up on how I was. Knowing that she was always thinking about someone else and the burdens that someone else was carrying was extraordinary, given what she was going through at that time. It
was this very skill that Judith brought to her public life. We have heard about her passion for the members of the ADF and for the health system. It was not just about a budget, which we might hear about later tonight, or billions of dollars; it was actually about people, whether it was particularly cancer survivors, people needing cancer treatments or members of the Australian Defence Force. It was about the experiences that people were having with the government and their own communities.

Her life experience and her understanding of her own community, as well as her understanding of what made bureaucrats tick and what made government work, were what made her such a powerful advocate. Judith's insight into people opened our eyes. In my time with Judith she opened my eyes to the lives and challenges of those with whom I did not share experiences and, when we talk about those who do bring such a broad experience of life, I think that maintaining an open mind and allowing them to share their experiences is so important.

I am glad that Senator Johnson mentioned the patient assisted transport scheme because that was one of my first long discussions with Senator Adams at a Senate committee hearing, and I note that today there has been a bit of controversy about it in South Australia. I imagine that Judith would have been hoping that one of us follows that up with as much rigour as we can muster, as she undoubtedly would have done in a couple of weeks at Senate estimates. There were many issues where Judith brought her own experience, issues which we could so easily forget as we talk about billions of dollars of government programs in the abstract but which mean so much to individuals who need the assistance of government or who need a system to work for them. Judith made sure we did not forget the people when we talked about government policy and when we had our occasional arguments, as we may have over the next few weeks.

Judith did this on myriad issues but, as people have highlighted, also on that particular passion for the health system, which all of us interface with and all of us touch through ourselves, our families and friends. Judith was a friend, a profoundly decent person and a valued colleague. Her strength and determination is an inspiration for all of us. She also reminded us about the real and practical importance of what we do here and, importantly, that we should value every moment of our own lives and our own ability to make a contribution to our family, to our friends and to this place. Judith, you are sorely missed. My deepest condolences to your family, particularly to your sons, Stuart and Robert, who were so gracious to share you with us.

Senator COLBECK (Tasmania) (16:05): I rise to lend support to this motion moved by Senator Abetz and to associate myself with the comments of other senators around the chamber who have paid tribute to Senator Judith Adams and her work here. Sometimes we think that the comments on or our contributions to these debates might not be adequate to actually provide a full and proper tribute to a colleague but I think that, as so often is the case in the committee work in particular, which Judith loved so much, the contribution of the whole actually does paint the picture that between us all we want to paint on behalf of a colleague like Judith, whom we have just lost.

It has been mentioned here today that Judith was not a high-profile senator, and that might be the case, but those that needed to know Judith did know Judith; they did know the work that she did and they knew that they could go to her to get the representation they wanted or needed in respect of a particular issue. She could often
appear unassuming but, once you got to know her, you knew that to take that unassuming nature for granted was a sincere mistake, because she would pursue something with all her being until she got the result she was looking to achieve. Her interests were particularly around issues that involved people in rural and regional communities. Like others, I can recall being in estimates and committee inquiries while she discussed in deep detail the workings, failings or otherwise of the patient assisted transport system, or how better to operate it. I think that is one particular thing. Anything to do with rural health and with women’s rural health was important to Judith—and rural education also, something that has not been mentioned here. I have been on backbench committees and heard her discuss quite passionately the requirements for people in regional and rural Australia to access the sort of education they need or the requirements for getting to centres for a high-quality education for their kids. She was really very passionate about that.

Judith’s practical knowledge was one of the things that she brought to debate and discussion; she had a practical knowledge. Colleagues have talked about the experience she brought to her role. That practical experience allowed her to assess how things might work and to interrogate departmental officers on the practicalities of making a particular program work—or, as she would have liked to have seen it, work better—in the interests of her communities. It did not matter whether you were talking about health issues, education issues or issues of rural importance to her. There has been discussion about the single desk today, but she would talk about issues for wool growers, wheat growers and graziers generally; it really did not matter. She brought a strength of opinion when talking about those particular matters and also a practical understanding.

For Judith, the issue was important. She could play the politics as hard and as well as anybody, and examples of that have been demonstrated in comments that have been made about her love of campaigning and doorknocking in seats where she had particular responsibility. She did that in a way which I think is an example to any aspirant to politics. In fact, it is an example to anybody who is involved in politics and really wants to make sure that they cover all the bases and campaign to the nth degree, which is what Judith did. But she did that not only as a matter of course; she did that, as we have heard a number of times today, on the back of quite severe illness and without any comment or expression of concern. She saw that as her job and she was not going to let anything get in the way of her objectives, whether they be on policy or in the context of campaigning in a marginal seat to make sure that she got the result that she wanted.

Judith’s unwillingness to allow her illness to impose on her work has been a theme of colleagues’ comments today, which I think is more than appropriate because she was not going to allow that to occur. I do not think I need to repeat what has been said by other colleagues, but I want to add my weight to those comments because what gave us the perspective of Judith as a woman and as a Senate colleague is the fact that she was prepared to put herself behind the role that she had been given, and the responsibility and the privilege that she had been given, to serve in this place in the context of looking after her constituents and of her role within the Liberal Party. Judith was someone who was vitally connected to her constituency, and that is why I made the comment I made earlier: she might not have been high profile, but in the communities where she was working she was certainly very well known. Obviously, in her home community of Kojonup she was loved and respected, and I
think that is a real measure of her and a
demonstration of the way in which she was
connected to her community. She knew them
well, and that is why she was so good at
doing what she was doing in her committee
work in this place. Not only was she
connected to her communities but she knew
them. She knew what they needed, she knew
what they wanted and she was able to
represent those things in this place.

I do not think there is any fear in saying
that Senator Judith Adams represented all of
those communities and all of those interests
in an absolutely exemplary fashion. She
served her state, she served her party and she
served this country with absolute di-

You would not say of Judith that she did
not suffer fools gladly; in fact, Judith was
pretty kind and very polite to fools. But
Judith would not suffer pretenders gladly.
She could spot one from about a hundred
paces. Particularly if one of her colleagues
was thinking of standing for something that
she did not really think we stood for, she
wasted very little time in putting her views
directly to that person. There was no
suffering pretenders gladly for our former
senator Judith Adams. She pretty much put
herself last. Her family knew very well what
they had in their 'senator mum', as they put it
at the funeral service. They knew what they
had; they knew what they were letting
Australian people share. I suspect even her
husband, Gordon, not expecting that he
would be taken first, knew that he was
sharing Judith and the reduced time Judith
had with the rest of the country. Her sons
must have known that Judith was continuing
to devote her diminishing time with the rest
of the country instead of with them. The
people of Kojonup in the south-west of
WA—'Koji' as we called it when we were
growing up in WA—knew exactly what they
had in Senator Judith Adams and they knew
exactly who was representing them in
Canberra and across the country. My mum
and I were speaking to the minister who
conducted the service just before she
started the service. I think she is from South Africa
and had come to Australia three or five
months prior. She said, in very polite terms,
she had been waiting for someone to fall off
the perch in Kojonup or Katanning—the two
communities for which she was responsi-
ble—and no-one had until Judith. Mum and I
said: 'Well, this will be one out of the box.
Koji probably hasn't seen one like it and
probably will never see one like it again.'

Judith's influence in rural and regional
Western Australia spread much further than
the people of Kojonup and the south-west. It
was my mum who first introduced me to Judith. My parents still farm at Beverley, where I grew up in the wheat belt, further north and more due east of Perth. Judith’s influence spread far and wide, so much so that at the funeral service a family friend of mine and a good friend of Judith’s, Lyn Hatherly, who farms at Arthur River, which forms a kind of border between the Great Southern region and the wheat belt, was at pains to call out: ‘Mary, Mary’—as family friends call me—’can you introduce me to Tony Abbott? I’ve got something I want to say to him.’ I thought now is not really the time at Judith’s funeral, but I said, ‘Sure, I’ll get you introduced to Tony Abbott.’ Of course, I dutifully did so just as Judith’s hearse was going down the street. ‘Tony, meet Lyn Hatherly, farmer from Arthur River.’ She said, ‘I just want to say one thing to you, Mr Abbott: Judith Adams was a fantastic advocate for country Western Australia.’ That is all Lyn Hatherly had to say to Tony. Country Western Australia knew what they had and know what they have lost.

Judith was also very caring about individual people. Others have spoken about the importance of her undying love for estimates, even when she was crook. About a year or 1½ years ago, she tore herself away from estimates with me to help a mutual acquaintance whose mental health we had some concerns about. Judith spent so much time—time she did not have—speaking to the family and gave them news they probably did not want to hear. Judith managed to get professional help for this person—again, stepping outside herself when she could have been focusing on herself.

Judith set up an office in Albany, Western Australia, the Christmas before last—showing the great lengths to which she would go. Senator Back has an office in Esperance, but Senator Adams was prepared to do the hard yards to Albany, one of the more difficult and challenging metropolitan centres electorally for us. Senator Eggleston, Senator Back and I went to the opening. There, again, Judith thought totally outside the box. I got a phone call out of the blue: ‘MJ, do you want to come to my opening?’ She knew how much of my youth I had spent growing up in Albany and she thought to invite me along. Indeed, I did go along.

Thank you, Senator Judith. Thank you to her family, and in particular to Stuart and Robert, for having shared their ‘senator mum’ with us. We are, and the country is, all the richer for having been able to share her. Thank you.

Senator RONALDSON (Victoria) (16:20): I rise with regret at not being able to attend the funeral for Judith with colleagues from both sides and I was anxious to speak today. I just want to reinforce those messages previous people have said about Judith’s passion, experience and pragmatism. It was quite a remarkable life.

I do want to talk about two other matters. Judith’s experience in Vietnam had left her as a long-term and passionate supporter of our returned men and women. While she was not overt about it, she worked very strongly and was an enormous support to them. I only saw Judith emotional once and that was at the Mount Clarence Light Horse memorial in Albany. I was there with her back in November 2010. She related the story of her father, who had left from Albany. She was a fierce, fierce supporter of Anzac and she was a fierce supporter of the bonds that remain to this day between our country and her birthplace, New Zealand. She was proud of her father’s endeavours, as she should have been. She was proud of Albany. I know that Alana Lacy, who was her staff member in Albany, and people like Tricia Matthews will
miss her desperately. There was that enormous passion. I have never served on a committee with Judith, so it has been an enlightening experience for me today to hear others talk about their remarkable experiences with her. I suppose mine have been more in a portfolio sense. I saw Judith's passion for the centenary of Anzac in my visits to her. I saw the passion of her staff in the office in Albany. I saw her passion in providing support for our candidate in O'Connor, Rick Wilson, whom she was fighting tirelessly for, and for whom I am sure she would want us to continue fighting tirelessly in the run-up to the next election.

I feel an enormous degree of sadness for what has happened, but what a remarkable legacy she has left her children. They should look, through all their sadness, at what their mother has done and they should be quite rightly enormously proud of that.

There has been a lot of talk today about Judith's interest in women's health; I would remind everyone that she was on the men's health select committee as well. So it was not just about women's health—she was a passionate supporter of the health of all of us. I remember being chastised by Judith on a number of occasions when I was 'going out to get some fresh air' with some others around this place. I copped a beating from her. We did share some past experiences in that regard. There was always a knowing nod. You knew that she was in diabolical strife. I know that when we were at Mount Clarence she was a very sick woman, but there was no way known she was not going to participate in something so deeply personal for her. Rest in peace, Judith.

Senator KROGER (Victoria—Chief Opposition Whip in the Senate) (16:24): Saturday, 31 March 2012 is a day that has made an indelible mark on me. I was in my electorate office in Burwood East when I received a phone call shortly after 10 o'clock advising me that Judith had died. Whilst we all knew that she was very ill, it still came as a huge shock to me, largely because I had made a phone call to her at home only on the previous Tuesday night. She had moved out of hospital and had returned home after the doctors had organised what is called, in medical terms, as Judith advised me, a peg into her stomach so that she could be fed through that and would be able to go home. At that time I had visited her in hospital, following Senator Evans and Senator Parry, and she had been incredibly upbeat and looking forward to the opportunity of resuming her life, although she was going to have to conduct herself in a very different way. She was coming to terms with the fact that she was going to have to consider how she conducted a parliamentary life whilst being fed through a peg directly into her stomach. So it really did come as a great shock, having only called on the Tuesday night. I spoke to Robbie, who I have got to know very well since I have been in the position of chief whip, who told me that he had just driven his mother to hospital and that they were doing some tests to see why the intravenous feeding was not working as it should. But they were hopeful that she would return home. After I got the news on the Saturday morning, and being quite shocked and very upset, I did call Robbie, who then spoke of the fact that in the last couple of days his mother had decided that she had no regrets and she felt that it was time to give way to nature, and that is what she did.

Having been counselled by Judith since being elected to the position of chief whip, I was very mindful today of what advice she would give me in conducting the way in which we honoured and paid tribute to her today. So it was with a great deal of trepidation that I considered something
which she would have thought was highly unusual and out of the ordinary—organising a floral tribute. In my mind, that would clearly bring memories and recollections for us of what Judith was like and how she organised her office. Those of us who visited her in her office would know that when you walked in she always had a fresh, beautiful posy of Victorian style flowers in her little reception area and a great big bunch of beautiful flowers, including gorgeous Christmas lilies, the perfume of which would emanate, and I would be the recipient of that perfume in the whip's office. So it was with some trepidation—because we know that Judith was a no-nonsense, no-fuss person, someone who would preach moderation in everything—that I organised the tribute, because I could imagine Judith telling me that it was an excessive waste of money and that it was all unnecessary. But I did think that it was something that was very much Judith and something that was quite appropriate for today.

My colleagues have reflected at length about her enormous contribution to this place, so I will not traverse ground that they have already covered, except to acknowledge a couple of things. Having been in the Senate since 2008, I had worked particularly closely with Judith since being elected whip last year. The first thing that struck me in my time working closely with her was her enormous work ethic. There was no greater demonstration of that than during the parliamentary sitting period late last year when the hours of the business here in the Senate were changed to accommodate more sitting days so that the carbon tax could be passed. The person who was most impacted by that, even though that person did not discuss it or argue why it would not be appropriate, was Judith. What people did not know was that every Friday that we sat was a Friday that Judith actually chose not to fly back to Perth and go to Royal Perth Hospital to have her chemotherapy. Every Friday she would try to get out so that that Friday or the following Monday she would be able to have her chemotherapy. By sitting during those two weeks in which the carbon tax was passed she decided that she would put off the chemotherapy that was so critically important for her own health so that she could do her job and so that no-one could suggest that she was a slouch and not actually doing her work. People have talked about her being stoic and about her strength, but I suggest that she was totally selfless, because there she put her own life in jeopardy by being in the Senate chamber and not having the chemotherapy which was absolutely critical for her health.

The last sitting week that we were here—and, as everybody in the chamber knows, it was an extra sitting week—was a week when she could not get here because it literally would have been a life-and-death situation if she came back for that week. Amazingly, I have to say, she decided that she would stay in her home state and be hooked up to the drugs that she had to be in Royal Perth Hospital.

She was a woman of enormous integrity. Those of us who went to her memorial service saw that. She would have been delighted that she had provided an opportunity for the 200 or so locals who attended that service to meet with their representatives in parliament so they could chew our ears off on issues of particular interest to them. I was sitting there thinking that she would be looking down and smiling from above, which is unquestionably where she is, about having orchestrated for us to meet all these locals whom she had been very effective and tenacious in representing here in this place.
In closing, I would like to recognise, firstly, Judith's office staff. So many of us naturally think of family at such a time, but to her and to them her staff were extended family. They did not merely work for Judith; they were a part of her extended family. It was an incredibly difficult time for them. I acknowledge Harriet Bateman in my office, who flew over and assisted Judith's office. They were more than capable of organising things themselves. As you can imagine, if you were working for Judith you were very capable of organising an office. But Harriet gave tremendous personal support to Judith's staff members. I really would like to put on the record my thanks to her for doing that. She is a young woman and it takes a bit of courage to do that. From Judith's office, I want to pay special tribute to Alexandra Nicol, Alana Lacy and Cate Creedon.

I also want to make a special note of Tricia Matthews. Trish, we all know, came across to Canberra with Judith and worked with Judith here. They were really like sisters. They were sisters in arms, if you like. Trish was very close to Judith in all sorts of ways. In the time that Judith was in Royal Perth Hospital—which was essentially several weeks, except when she had an office function in December, before she passed away—Trish would visit her every day.

Judith's hospital room was like an office. I visited her there, with Senator Evans and Senator Parry, and we can attest that it was like an office. In some of the rooms that she was moved into she could not get internet access, which annoyed her no end, so Trish would print off emails. Judith was still working right through this time. She also did not shy away from giving me advice when I visited her. She asked me to let our colleagues on this side know that Radio National did record all the interjections and all the interjections could be heard during question time. Not only could they be heard but she could name the people making them. She gave me their names and she said, 'Helen, you've got to go back and tell them'—for the benefit of my colleagues here I will not name them today—they've got to be more careful what they say. If I can hear them, everybody else can.' She was really on the job till the last.

Like my colleagues I would like to particularly pay tribute to her family, Stuart and Robbie, and to her extended family and Gordon's family in Western Australia. I had the benefit of sitting with them at the memorial service. They told some terrific stories. As my other colleagues have said, it is a shame that we are only able to get to know people more fully at such times. I think we should all learn some lessons from that and perhaps try to get to know each other a little better and more fully whilst we are in this place.

Judith was a great woman. She had a wonderful family. She has left a tremendous family. She made such a contribution to this place, to Western Australia and, most of all, to all Australians.

Question agreed to, honourable senators standing in their places.

**Bowen, Hon. Lionel Frost, AC**

The PRESIDENT (16:37): It is with deep regret that I inform the Senate of the death, on 1 April 2012, of Hon. Lionel Frost Bowen, a former Deputy Prime Minister, minister and member of the House of Representatives for the division of Kingsford Smith, New South Wales, from 1969 to 1990.

**Senator Faulkner** (New South Wales) (16:38): by leave—At the request of
the Leader of the Government in the Senate, Senator Evans, I move:

That the Senate records its deep regret at the death, on 1 April 2012, of the Honourable Lionel Frost Bowen, AC, former member for Kingsford-Smith, places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious public service, and tenders its profound sympathy to his family in their bereavement.

This afternoon I want to acknowledge Lionel Bowen's years of public service, his dedication to the Australian Labor Party and his commitment to faith and family. Lionel Bowen was born in Sydney's working-class suburb of Ultimo during the depth of the Depression. In his early life he came to know hardship firsthand. His mother worked day and night as a cleaner to support Lionel. She supported Lionel, his invalid brother and also his grandmother. Lionel himself left school at 14 to help support the family, working first as a messenger and later as a law clerk while attending night school.

In one of those extraordinary coincidences, another Lionel, also in the Labor Party, also a lawyer, also a minister in the Whittlam government and also an Attorney-General of the Commonwealth of Australia—Lionel Murphy—attended the same kindergarten and school as Lionel Bowen. The two Lions lived just four doors from each other and played together as children. The hardship of Lionel Bowen's youth was disrupted by World War II. He was conscripted and served with the AIF from 1941 to 1945, rising to the rank of corporal. After the war he took advantage of the Chifley government's postwar rehabilitation scheme to study law at the University of Sydney, graduating in 1946. I am sure that these modest beginnings helped shape Lionel Bowen's commitment to Labor. His early struggles ensured that he remained forever conscious of the plight of those on the margins of society. His firsthand experience of retraining after the war showed him the positive role government can play in improving people's lives.

While working as a solicitor, Lionel Bowen stood for Randwick Council in 1948, and so began 42 years in public life. He would serve as Mayor of Randwick twice, first in 1950, at just 27 years of age, and then again in 1955. On council he oversaw the opening of the Windgap School for the Intellectually Disabled at Coogee—a very proud achievement of his time in local government. He would also serve greater Sydney as a member of Sydney County Council from 1957 to 1962.

In 1962 Lionel stepped up to state politics, contesting the then marginal state seat of Randwick, which he won. He became a leading caucus critic as the Heffron and Renshaw Labor governments limped towards defeat in 1965. As a state MP he advocated reforms to the then notorious New South Wales prison system, to liquor licensing laws, to the constraints applying to the issuing of taxi plates, and he strongly opposed rent rises for Housing Commission tenants.

Historian David Clune was told by Reg Downing, the eminence grise of the state parliamentary Labor Party of the time, that Lionel Bowen would have been leader if he had stayed in state politics. And Jack Ferguson, from the left, is reported to have approached Lionel to run against Pat Hills for leader, and promised to deliver him the left's votes. But it was not to be, and in 1969 Lionel Bowen left Macquarie Street to succeed Dan Curtin as the federal member for Kingsford Smith. He came to Canberra at a time of transition for the ALP. Party reforms driven by Labor's leader Gough Whitlam were resulting in the ALP broadening its base.

As well as Lionel Bowen, the federal Labor caucus class of 1969 included,
amongst others, four doctors—Moss Cass, Doug Everingham, Dick Klugman and Richie Gun; a diplomat, Bill Morrison; a pharmacist, Joe Berinson; an economist, Rex Patterson; an accountant, Chris Hurford; a small businessman, Barry Cohen; and a future Prime Minister, Paul Keating. Bowen shared a cramped office in Old Parliament House with the last of those new arrivals. He was immediately struck by Keating's incredible intensity. From this time onward he would be a confidant and mentor to Keating, who was a man more than 20 years his junior.

Lionel Bowen served as the member for Kingsford Smith for 21 tumultuous years. He was a constant for the party during those years—years of despair and of triumph for the ALP. When Gough Whitlam came to power in 1972 Lionel was elected by caucus to serve in the ministry. Initially underwhelmed, Whitlam offered his congratulations with the dismissive: 'Well, Bowen, you've made it,' to which Lionel tersely replied, 'No bloody thanks to you.' Much is revealed about Lionel Bowen's character in this early exchange. Lionel was never overwhelmed by anyone. He remained unaffected by high office and was never intimidated by those who held it. In the words of close friend 'Johnno' Johnson, he was at home with the kings and the peasants.

Despite Whitlam's initial reticence, his estimation of Bowen would change with Bowen's effective stewardship of the portfolios of Postmaster-General, Special Minister of State and Minister for Manufacturing and Industry in Whitlam's cabinet. In 1973, as acting Minister for Education he oversaw the passage of the Schools Commission Bill by getting a reluctant Country Party to cross the floor under the threat of an early election This legislation, for the first time, saw funding allocated to non-government schools based on need. On hearing that the bill had passed Whitlam is reported to have said, 'Comrade, this is terrific. Perhaps you can be my successor.' For Bowen this achievement was more than just a personal triumph. In his own words, it represented 'the most fundamental gain for the cause of equality in Australia.'

My favourite story about Lionel's time as a minister in the Whitlam government is one he told me over a cup of tea in his lounge room five years ago. Lionel, who was a great raconteur, reminisced about a trade mission to the Kremlin in 1975 when, along with Gough, he met with Alexei Kosygin and other Soviet leaders. The meeting dragged. With the aid of a translator, apparently Kosygin said 'I'm delighted to have this meeting. This is the first occasion an Australian Prime Minister has visited the Kremlin, despite the fact we have fought alongside each other in two world wars. Now, let's do something big to honour this occasion, like a major trade announcement. The Soviet Union could take a substantial amount of your wheat and your wool, and you, from Australia, could reciprocate with landing rights for Aeroflot, and take minerals and cargo ships from the Soviet Union.' Gough responded, I am told, to a speechless Kosygin and certainly a stunned Lionel Bowen: 'I don't want to talk with you about mundane things like trade. I want to know what happened to the Grand Duchess Anastasia in 1918.' There was no trade announcement.

Despite Gough's musings after the success of the Schools Commission Bill, Lionel Bowen would not be his successor, but he would challenge for the ALP leadership on two occasions. The first time was against Whitlam himself after Labor's election defeat in 1975. In the ballot, Whitlam received the official endorsement of the dominant right-wing faction of the New South Wales branch of the ALP, including the support of its
supremo, John Ducker. Lionel Bowen refused the entreaties of his own New South Wales right-wing power base to withdraw from that contest. The result: Whitlam received 36 votes to Bowen's 14 and Frank Crean's 13. The second leadership ballot occurred after Labor's defeat in the 1977 election, when Lionel was defeated by Bill Hayden more narrowly: 35 votes to 22. After that setback, Lionel Bowen immediately contested and won the next ballot, for deputy leadership of the federal parliamentary Labor Party, defeating the incumbent, Tom Uren, Mick Young and Ralph Willis.

Perhaps in those dark years after the defeat of the Whitlam government, a less committed, less dedicated man may have been content with a quarter of a century of meritorious public service across four tiers of government. But Lionel Bowen would continue to serve for more than seven years of opposition during the Fraser government. In his biography of Bill Hayden, John Stubbs reflected on those years of opposition:

Relations between Fraser and the Opposition remained acrimonious throughout Hayden's term as leader. Within weeks of Hayden becoming Opposition Leader, Fraser summoned him and his deputy Lionel Bowen to his office to inform them of some matters connected with security. Hayden nodded his head occasionally as Fraser spoke, but there was no response at all from Bowen. Eventually Fraser asked Bowen what was wrong with him. Bowen answered; 'I'm listening. It's just that I don't trust you, you bastard.' As they left Hayden congratulated Bowen for being so direct with the Prime Minister.

After Bill Hayden's replacement by Bob Hawke as Labor leader and Hawke's victory in the 1983 election a little over a month later, Lionel Bowen was to serve again in cabinet as Deputy Prime Minister, Minister for Trade and Attorney-General in the Hawke government. As Attorney-General, Bowen convinced a sceptical cabinet to back a comprehensive review of the Constitution. The subsequent referendum in 1988 proposed four constitutional reforms: to 'extend the right to trial by jury, to extend freedom of religion, and to ensure fair terms for persons whose property is acquired by any government'; to provide for four-year federal terms; 'to alter the Constitution to provide for fair and democratic parliamentary elections throughout Australia'; and to give constitutional recognition to local government. All four questions were defeated—in fact, so badly that no question received a majority of votes in any state. Despite this, these reforms remain important ambitions for many on the progressive side of politics.

Lionel Bowen would remain Attorney-General and Deputy Prime Minister until his retirement in 1990. He remains the longest serving Deputy Prime Minister in Labor's history. I am pleased that I had the pleasure of serving in caucus with Lionel Bowen—albeit for just a short time—at the end of Lionel's parliamentary career and at the beginning of mine. In retirement, Lionel Bowen served as chairman of the National Gallery of Australia and was made a Companion of the Order of Australia in 1991 for his contribution to politics and the arts. Through all his years of high office he remained in the same modest Kensington home with his wife Claire. It suited Lionel. It was close to Randwick racecourse and to Maroubra Beach. Horseracing and bodysurfing were two of his great passions. The house was simply extended from time to time to accommodate the couple's eight children. Lionel Bowen passed away in this home. He ended life as he lived it: unbowed and with dignity, surrounded by family.

Lionel Bowen saw public service not as a vehicle for personal advancement but as a vocation with the purpose of improving the lives of others and serving in the nation's interest. His time on the national stage never diminished his deep commitment to his local...
community. As my colleague Senator Bob Carr said—and Bob, of course, knew him so well: 'He knew suburban politics like the back of his hand.'

Lionel Bowen's service to the ALP was not an opportunistic folly based on personal ambition. It was a calling, based on deeply held beliefs and an unremitting dedication to the cause of Labor. Lionel was one who put this cause before his personal interests. He is an example to us all. I offer my sincere sympathy to Lionel's family and friends.

Senator ABETZ (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition in the Senate) (16:56): Family, church and ALP were Lionel Bowen's three 'great loves'. That was how the Catholic Weekly succinctly eulogised former Deputy Prime Minister Lionel Frost Bowen AC. A Labor mate of his, Johno Johnson, mentioned the same three loves and added a fourth. He said:

Lionel had a number of loves. First was for his family, his Church and God, his political party and his Irish heritage.

Johno Johnson observed that he was 'a man whose integrity shone forth as clear as the noonday sun.'

Objectively, those descriptions are true. Lionel Bowen's political career spanned over four decades—42 years, to be exact—at a local, state and federal level. Everyone who met Lionel Bowen was struck by his essential goodness, his sincerity, his self-effacing nature, his loyalty, his good judgment and his humour. His life is an essay on what is achievable in Australia, this great country of equal opportunity. He rose from a messenger boy to become Deputy Prime Minister—a real-life example of the cream of the Labor movement genuinely rising to the top.

Lionel Bowen was born in the inner Sydney suburb of Ultimo in 1922. His father, Samuel, was a soap maker. His mother was deserted when Lionel was only 10 and was left to tend to her son, her invalid brother and her elderly mother while working as a cleaner—circumstances that forced the young Lionel to leave school at age 14. He became a messenger and a legal clerk and continued to study at night school. During the war he served in the Army, rising to the rank of corporal during his four years of service. Afterwards he studied law at Sydney University under a postwar rehabilitation scheme. Shortly after working as a solicitor he became an alderman of Randwick Council, becoming mayor at age 27. By 39 he was a state member of the New South Wales Legislative Assembly, representing the seat of Randwick. In 1969 he was elected to federal parliament as the member for Kingsford Smith.

A speech from 1970 gave an early guide to his character. Touching on the war in Vietnam, he said:

People who are now concerned about their sons are interested in the fact that there should have been a mandate from the Australian people. It is no use saying, as was said in the defence statement, that we cannot confront that Soviet Union. I think the Australian national spirit is such that we should be prepared and in fact would be prepared to confront anybody if the need so arose.

Here was a man who got straight to the essential issue and whose moral convictions led him to the right conclusions.

From 1972 to 1975 Lionel Bowen served as Minister for Manufacturing Industry, Special Minister of State and Postmaster-General in the Whitlam government. In 1975 he was elected deputy opposition leader by the Labor caucus. From 1983 to 1990 he served as Minister for Trade then as Attorney-General and Deputy Prime Minister under Prime Minister Hawke. In 1991 he was deservedly appointed a Companion of the Order of Australia. And it
is in his role as Deputy Prime Minister that he is most remembered.

As a minister Lionel Bowen has been described as 'delightful', 'a great minister', 'one of the best'—he showed courtesy and consideration', was 'playful', was 'even-tempered' and 'full of good humour'. A former public servant shared this anecdote. Lionel Bowen had asked him to fix a problem with Telecom, so the public servant dutifully carried out the instruction. He went back to report to Mr Bowen and, during the time he had taken to carry out the instructions, Mr Bowen had been visited by another minister and had done a 180-degree turn on his original instruction. When the public servant asked Mr Bowen why he replied, 'Ah, champ—never trust a pollie; the double-cross is always on.'

Lionel Bowen was responsible for the Remuneration Tribunal. He asked for draft legislation in the morning and it was done by that evening. It just goes to show that the Public Service, when ably instructed, can move quickly! In 1989 Lionel Bowen became the longest-serving minister from the ranks of the Australian Labor Party in the history of the Australian parliament. At the time Prime Minister Hawke said:

It adds lustre to that achievement, and for honourable members on this side of the House a very special significance, when I say that that record of service will then surpass that of our great and beloved leader Ben Chifley.

After retiring Lionel Bowen spent much of his time as Chairman of the Australian National Gallery in Canberra. This continued an interest foreshadowed by his announcement as Special Minister of State in 1974 of a Committee of Inquiry on Museums and National Collections. Mr Bowen was responsible for the beginnings of the Australian National Museum, with a friend of his—Peter Pigott, who was appointed to chair the inquiry and report. He followed through with the idea and made it happen. At the time he noted that the development of museums and collections had been piecemeal, that there was no institution committed to telling the story of Australia to Australians. That is now the role of the National Museum. Bowen followed through with ideas and made things happen.

In the days since Lionel Bowen has left this place, the reputation of politicians as a class has not necessarily risen. In contrast, Lionel Bowen was a man who, if I might say, gave the Labor Party a good name and also gave politics a good name. The parliament could do with more political figures of the ilk of Lionel Bowen—inspired and informed, as he was, by his faith to improve our society. The Daily Telegraph editorial noted that 'Lionel Bowen was a civilised and dignified presence in Australian politics for more than four decades'. It went on to say that 'Lionel Bowen was from a different era of Australian public life. In many ways it was a better era thanks to politicians of Mr Bowen's style and substance.'

The coalition extends its deepest sympathy to Lionel Bowen's widow, Claire, their five sons, three daughters, 18 grandchildren and one great-grandchild. We thank them for lending him to the service of his nation. We on this side salute Lionel Bowen's distinguished, lengthy and exemplary service to our nation.

**Senator BOB CARR** (New South Wales—Minister for Foreign Affairs) (17:04): It is a real privilege for me to stand in this chamber and pay tribute to Lionel Bowen. I can remember as a teenager—I must have been 16—going into the New South Wales parliament once, in the school holidays, besotted with politics, and Lionel Bowen, elected member for Randwick in 1962, was there on his feet, talking about a
range of things. The issue of state aid was very big. He was saying, 'Menzies is getting credit for state aid to non-state schools, but I was at the last state ALP conference and a bloke in his shirt-sleeves got up and said we ought to be helping these local schools build their science blocks; that's where the idea came from—a bloke at the state ALP conference, not from Bob Menzies.' There was sectarian politics that swirled around both sides in those days. Someone on the other side of the chamber said, 'Yeah, and when it comes you'll be right behind it.' It was a real nasty, narky sectarian interjection. And I remember that later in his speech, a wide-ranging speech, Lionel got on to rent control. Can you believe that rent control prevailed in Sydney's suburbs at the time? Someone from the Liberal side said what a disaster it was—and they were entirely correct—and Lionel said, 'There have been a lot of elections in New South Wales fought on rent control.' It is just a nostalgic thought that comes back to me over all these years. Here was I, a teenager at Matraville High School, besotted with politics, turning up in the gallery of the state parliament to hear the bloke we are memorialising today.

I was honoured to be his campaign director for 18 years and chairman of his federal electoral council for 18 years. I read a lot of his reports in those days. In ways that might even shock Senator Cameron, Lionel was an unabashed protectionist. I would always hear him say, at least at every second FEC meeting, 'Why, in this country we can produce anything; we can manufacture anything.' He was a deep-dyed protectionist. All the standard issues of the time were aired by Lionel, reporting in Randwick Labor Club or Redfern Town Hall, to his federal electoral council. I was lucky enough to be in the chair and hear his wisdom. I backed him in the 1968 preselection, taking him around the members of the Malabar branch, so fondly regarded by Senator Thistlethwaite, right through to today, to see that he got a share of the votes in the Malabar-South Matraville branch, as it then was.

I loved the Bowen stories, such as the story that Senator Faulkner recalled about Lionel Bowen and Gough Whitlam visiting the Kremlin. I tweak my version slightly from the one Senator Faulkner retailed. The Soviet leadership was there to talk about big barter arrangements. They wanted to send us their tractors and get our wheat in return. They would be big trade deals. But Lionel was hugely amused that Gough allegedly said, 'I want to talk about Nicholas II.' He wanted to talk about the last of the Romanovs.

Lionel loved that story and also the one about being appointed Postmaster-General in the Whitlam government—that was his first portfolio. He turned up at the old GPO, where there was a minister's office. The head of the department showed him the office he would use, and Lionel said to him, 'No, I think I will take the office down the corridor,' which was the public servants' area and far more grand, more spacious, more elegant and more of a heritage item. From that morning he won the heroic battle with the bureaucracy, with the public service. He showed them all the cunning and the strength he had accumulated from his time in local politics in the Eastern Suburbs—those years on Randwick Council, the years fighting for the numbers in the ALP and the years getting elected and campaigning at street corner meetings to hold the seat of Randwick and get into Kingsford Smith. In those days we did have street corner meetings. They were a total waste of time. They would not have shifted one vote. And there was Lionel in those baggy pants of his, his white shirt hanging out over them, with a defective microphone
and broadcasting equipment, pounding out a message to uncomprehending shoppers on a Saturday morning at Kingsford or Randwick or Maroubra Junction. But we seemed to endure it; it was good for us.

I remember as his campaign director getting on the phone to him on 12 November 1975, after the dismissal of the Whitlam government. Lionel said, 'Ah, champ, what people seem to want on these campaigns is meetings. They like meetings.' On the Labor side of politics we had become very fond of meetings in the one month during which the budget was blocked in the Senate. So we organised meetings in Botany Town Hall and all the rest. The only people who came were Labor Party loyalists. The rest of the community was not even remotely interested. We received a thumping in Kingsford Smith as well as elsewhere on polling day.

But that was the local politics in which I was able to imbibe, I hope, some of the wisdom of Lionel, delivered in that 'oh, champ' wry, laconic manner that spoke of the racecourse at Randwick, of his life in the suburbs, of his background in the army as a very young man, and of his lone parent mother looking after him. I remember how he was very sad in 1968, I think, when his dear old mum died.

I remember his work for prison reform when he was in the state parliament, which Senator Faulkner referred to. I remember the performance of a play called Fortune and Men's Eyes at the Ensemble Theatre. After the play, which was about savage conditions in an American prison, they turned it over to Lionel Bowen. His work on the state parliamentary committee had illuminated a strong case for prison reform. He spoke about the things he saw in the prisons of New South Wales in the 1960s. He spoke about the shocking sanitary conditions and overcrowding and about the people with severe mental problems—what we call developmental disability today—stranded in the prison system without support or training or education. He spoke about the hopelessness of it. The report he was associated with was a very strong one, and it was the basis for prison reform delivered by Attorney-General Maddison, in the Askin government. But they are very much matters that are on the agenda to this day.

As have other senators, I extend my condolences to the Bowen family, to Claire, to Anne and the seven other children. They can be very proud of their husband's and father's contribution to public life in Australia. He was very proud to be a member of the state parliament and to have in his background the fact of having been Mayor of Randwick and of having served in this national parliament. In 1995, the morning after the night on which I was elected Premier after the votes had finally come in and it had been broadcast on the TV news that my team had been elected to government in New South Wales, I was standing in the Parliament House office, packing cases all around me. It was a shambles. It was very early in the morning and the rest of the staff had not arrived to participate in this happy transition from opposition to government. Out of nowhere appeared this somewhat diminished figure of Lionel Bowen—he had been in retirement and he was beginning at last to look his age, because he had always looked preternaturally young—in the baggy suit and with the wry lopsided smile. It was a measure of our friendship over the decades—our engagement in local politics, me helping him as his campaign director, as someone helping him get preselection votes—that he turned up to say to me, in effect, 'Well, you never succeeded me in my seat as we sort of planned, but I am here as one pro to another to say, 'It is nice to see
you become Premier." He shook my hand and his smile and the light in his eyes meant a great deal to me.

Senator LUDLAM (Western Australia) (17:14): I would like to add some words on behalf of the Australian Greens team and add our condolences on the passing of former Deputy Prime Minister Lionel Bowen. I have enjoyed listening to the words of Senators Faulkner and Carr in describing the friendships that have lasted through this extraordinary political career. Looking back at the words used to describe Mr Bowen, they are not words often associated with politics. Apart from being described as dyed-in-the-wool Labor he is described as being unassuming, as self-effacing, as modest. These are qualities that are rare for people in our line of work. So modest in fact, the man who apparently once said that charisma was a brand of cheese was barely known outside of politics and outside of the Randwick area. But I think you can say, particularly going back to read some of his comments in his inaugural speech in parliament, that he gave effect to the idea that politics, while being local, can still be pursued on the national stage. He had a long association with a particular beloved part of Sydney but, as he noted in his inaugural speech:

It follows, therefore, that the problems of Kingsford Smith—

this is just after he had been elected—

are virtually the problems of the nation, whether they relate to health, housing, pollution or any other matter.

He pursued before it became political jargon the cause of the battler, the cause of people who are disadvantaged in society, and took their cause all the way through to very senior cabinet positions.

Lionel Bowen had an extraordinary career of 42 years in public life, having served in four tiers of Australian political life between 1948 and 1990. It was particularly interesting to see the work he had done, which Senator Faulkner touched on, on proposed constitutional reforms when as Prime Minister Hawke's Attorney he persuaded an apparently sceptical cabinet to back a commission to review the Constitution. It is interesting to note 24 years later how many of these issues are still live, in particular the proposal for constitutional recognition of local government, which is a cause that I took up as local government spokesperson. One day we will get there, but it is remarkable to review how long some of these issues can be on the cards. Four-year terms for federal parliament is an idea that, although I think it would create some real complexities for this place, nonetheless would do the House of Representatives the world of good. Another issue was entrenchment of a range of civil rights. And apparently as Mayor of Randwick in the 1950s he was investigating recycling schemes well ahead of his time. He is described by friends and former colleagues in terms such as this from fellow minister Michael Duffy:

If all politicians, particularly ministers, had such a lack of pretension and conducted themselves as well as Lionel, politicians would be thought a lot more of in the community.

These are words we could all contemplate. There are some beautiful descriptions by Richard Carleton from an interview in 1987 while Mr Bowen was Australia's Attorney-General. Mr Carleton noted:

Mr Bowen is very, very low profile, so low profile in fact he almost shuns publicity.

How extraordinarily times have changed. Sure, he'll come on television and talk about this or that if you ask him nicely, but he's just as happy not to. He lives in a very unpretentious home in his lower middle-class electorate of Kingsford Smith and when he is here in Canberra it is not the flash Lodge or the first-class hotels
for him. No, he lives in a converted garage in the backyard of one of his relatives.

He was, as noted, from a different era of Australian public life. It was an era that I think we can perhaps recall with fondness and with regret at its passing but we can recall why those values were cherished in public life. I am pleased to be able to add the condolences of the Australian Greens to the words of my colleagues, to his widow Claire and his large family.

**Senator THISTLETHWAITE** (New South Wales) (17:18): It is a humbling honour to pay tribute to Lionel Frost Bowen, a true gentleman, a working-class hero who rose from adversity to become our nation’s Deputy Prime Minister. He was my local member for many years. Lionel was a role model for any young person in Labor politics. I was just old enough to remember his time as our nation's Deputy Prime Minister and Attorney-General. When I first met him I was struck by his warm, likeable character and of course his wonderful intelligence. Upon meeting him I read much more about his career and his time in the parliament. The more I read the more I came to admire him: intelligent, hard-working and principled, a man of the people, just as much at home in the betting ring at his beloved Randwick racecourse as he would be meeting the leaders of other nations.

Like many Labor leaders of that time, he was born and raised in difficult circumstances, in tough financial conditions. As Senator Faulkner pointed out, he was born in the very working class suburb of Ultimo. His mother, Elsie, raised him in tough circumstances. His father had left the family when he was 10 years old and his mother was forced to care for her invalid brother and her elderly mother and of course raise her son. She did this by working as a cleaner at the local school in the evenings, and as a consequence Lionel saw very little of his mother during his formative years. Despite that, Lionel’s character was shaped by his mother’s determination to give her son a good education and a pathway out of poverty. Lionel was eternally grateful for his mother’s guts and hard work in ensuring that her son grew up to a better life. Lionel never forgot the role his mother played in his advancement.

In 1939 his family moved to a new family home in Mooramie Avenue in Kensington, and that was to become his family home for the rest of his life until his passing on 1 April this year in that very home. I have very fond memories as a child growing up in the eastern suburbs when my family would go for a Chinese meal in Kensington and we would often drive home past Lionel's house in Mooramie Avenue. My father would always say to me when we drove past the Bowen family home how lucky we were to have such a wonderful man, a wonderful Australian, as our local member. Lionel was educated at the local Catholic college, Marcellin, in Randwick. Although he left school at age 14, he served in the Second Australian Imperial Force in World War II and on return studied law, graduating with an LLB in 1946. He then set up a local practice as a solicitor, Bowen and Gerathy Lawyers, and that firm is still in existence today, rather appropriately with his daughter Ann as now one of the managing partners of that practice.

He served for many years on Randwick Council as an alderman and as the mayor. He became the mayor in 1948. It is interesting that at the age of 27, as the mayor, he attended his first mayoral ball with his lady mayoress—none other than his mother, Elsie. His contribution to the city of Randwick was recognised in the 1990s when the local library, in Anzac Parade at Maroubra, was named in his honour.
He served in the New South Wales parliament as a member of the Legislative Assembly from 1962 to 1969 as the member for Randwick. Interestingly, in his first election, at the scrutineering which took place at Randwick Town Hall, a young Liberal Party member by the name of John Howard was to meet his future wife, Janette, then a resident of Daceyville in the local area.

In 1969 he stood for and was successful in the seat of Kingsford Smith and succeeded the former local member, Danny Curtin. At that time Kingsford Smith was a marginal constituency with an electoral margin of less than two per cent. When Lionel retired in 1990, it was well and truly a safe Labor seat, a true reflection of the regard in which Lionel was held by the local residents.

He of course served in the Whitlam and Hawke governments in a number of portfolios already outlined. As Senator Faulkner has noted, he was the sponsor of four unsuccessful referendums, including one advocating four-year terms for this place and the House of Representatives and amendments to recognise local government in our Constitution. But he is probably most remembered, in terms of policy achievements, for his reforms to introduce needs based funding for non-government schools.

Writing in Online Catholics on 13 October 2004, he rather amusingly outlined the process by which he would come to sponsor this bill in the House of Representatives. He said:

Gough Whitlam said, "Listen Bowen, you're a Catholic aren't you? This schools report legislation has come back. Beazley is in hospital but I don't know whether I can trust you with this legislation". He said, "I've got Grassby here". I said, "Give it to Grassby, that's the best thing to do".

Whitlam replied:

"No … I want you to have it. I want to get this bill through".

Bowen went on to state:

So I made a speech … I talked about the advantages the Catholic Education system has given to Australia, about the dedication of those who work in it, about the parents who support it. Are you going to deny these children a fair chance to compete on the same basis? … I said the best thing we could do was have a double dissolution on this. We'll take it to the people.

Ralph Hunt and Peter Nixon, two of the Country Party fellows, came round to me afterwards and said, Lionel, you don't really mean that. Of course we do, I said. We'll wipe the floor with you on this issue, you know that.

Some days later, the two chaps from the Country Party came back and said:

There are a couple of schools in our electorates that need a little topping up … Could you help us? …

So when the bill comes back on, I've increased their subsidy. There is a vote. The whole of the Country Party came across the floor and voted with us.

That is an amusing but factual account of that very important reform introduced and successfully passed through this parliament by Lionel Bowen.

In 2008 I had the honour of organising a tribute dinner for Lionel Bowen on behalf of the New South Wales branch, and I met with him and Claire at his home in Kensington. Although his Alzheimer's at the time was visible, I sat and had a cup of tea with him and we talked for an hour about local politics and national politics and despaired about our beloved South Sydney Rabbitohs. The function that occurred was an instant sell-out. Former prime ministers Paul Keating and Bob Hawke made tributes. It was the last occasion on which Lionel Bowen spoke publicly, and he received a standing ovation, a fitting tribute to his service to our party and to this parliament.
On 1 April of this year, Lionel Bowen passed away in the morning. That afternoon the Rabbitohs played the Tigers at the Sydney Football Stadium in the heritage round of the rugby league. With five minutes to go, Lionel's beloved Rabbitohs were down 16-four and all looked lost. At full-time the score was 16-all and the game went into extra time. Amazingly, the Rabbitohs kicked a field goal to secure an unlikely win over the Tigers. I sat and had a beer and watched that game with my brother-in-law. At the conclusion of the game, he turned to me and said, 'How the hell did we win that one?' I simply replied that in my view Lionel Bowen had a hand in that field goal.

I pay tribute to a man who served the people of Kingsford Smith, Randwick and Randwick City Council with distinction and I offer condolences to Claire and his family.

Question agreed to, honourable senators standing in their places.

NOTICES

Presentation

Senator Heffernan to move:

That the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Wednesday, 9 May 2012, from 5 pm, to take evidence for the committee's inquiry into the approval and monitoring of Poly Implant Prothese (PIP) breast implants.

Senator Bob Brown to move:

That the Senate—

(a) notes:

(i) the national significance of celebrating the foundation of the centenary of Australia's capital city,

(ii) the opportunity for tourists and local residents to experience historic, cultural, sports and entertainment events and exhibitions throughout the 2013 calendar year, and

(iii) the funding commitments made by both the Federal and Australian Capital Territory Governments for programs planned for the centenary celebrations in 2013; and

(b) calls on the Federal Government to ensure adequate funding to the Australian Capital Territory Government and the National Capital Authority to support the programs planned for the centenary celebrations.

Senator Milne to move:

That the Senate—

(a) reaffirms its commitment to increase overseas development assistance (ODA) to at least 0.5 per cent of gross national income (GNI) by 2015; and

(b) calls on the Government to implement a timetable for raising ODA to 0.7 per cent of GNI, the international aid target called for by the United Nations.

Senator Hanson-Young to move:

That the following matters be referred to the Legal and Constitutional Affairs References Committee for inquiry and report by 28 June 2012:

(a) whether any Indonesian minors are currently being held in Australian prisons, remand centres or detention centres where adults are also held, and the appropriateness of that detention;

(b) what information the Australian authorities possessed or had knowledge of when it was determined that a suspect or convicted person was a minor;
(c) whether there have been cases where information that a person is a minor was not put before the court;

(d) what checks and procedures exist to ensure that evidence given to an Australian authority or department about the age of a defendant/suspect is followed up appropriately;

(e) the relevant procedures across agencies relating to cases where there is a suggestion that a minor has been imprisoned in an adult facility; and

(f) options for reparation and repatriation for any minor who has been charged (contrary to current government policy) and convicted.

Senator Hanson-Young to move:

That there be laid on the table no later than 28 June 2012 by the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, the following:

(a) any draft or final legal advice regarding the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan obtained by the department;

(b) any legal advice regarding the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan obtained by another party and provided to the department;

(c) any draft or final legal advice that comments on whether the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan is consistent with the Water Act 2007;

(d) any draft or final legal advice that comments on the constitutionality of the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan; and

(e) any draft or final legal advice that comments on the prospects of a legal challenge of the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan by an Australian state or territory.

Senator Hanson-Young to move:

That—

(a) the Senate calls on the Government to direct the Productivity Commission to inquire into Commonwealth funding of early childhood education and care, including the effectiveness and eligibility of the Child Care Rebate and Child Care Benefit, and the potential productivity gains of Commonwealth funded childcare options that are affordable, flexible and accessible and of high-quality; and

(b) the inquiry should cover all Commonwealth funding options and models for various types of care, including long-day care, in-home care, occasional care, family day care, outside school hours care and care for children with special needs.

Senator Collins to move:

That, subject to introduction in the House of Representatives, the provisions of paragraphs (5) to (8) of standing order 111 not apply to the Family Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment (Schoolkids Bonus Budget Measures) Bill 2012, allowing it to be considered during this period of sittings.

Senator Collins to move:

That—

(1) To ensure appropriate consideration of time critical bills by Senate committees, the provisions of all bills introduced into the House of Representatives after 10 May 2012 and up to and including 31 May 2012 that contain substantive provisions commencing on or before 1 July 2012 (together with the provisions of any related bill), are referred to committees for inquiry and report by 18 June 2012.

(2) The committee to which each bill is referred shall be determined in accordance with the order of 29 September 2010, as amended on 8 February 2012, allocating departments and agencies to standing committees.

(3) A committee to which a bill has been referred may determine, by unanimous decision, that there are no substantive matters that require examination and report that fact to the Senate.

(4) This order does not apply in relation to bills which contain:

(a) no provisions other than provisions appropriating revenue or moneys (appropriation bills); and

(b) commencement clauses providing only for the legislation to commence on Royal Assent.

Senator Collins to move:

That consideration of the business before the Senate on Monday, 18 June 2012 be interrupted at approximately 5.30 pm, but not so as to interrupt a senator speaking, to enable Senator
Smith to make his first speech without any question before the chair.

Senator Collins to move:
That, on Thursday, 10 May 2012:
(a) the routine of business from not later than 12.30 pm to 1.50 pm shall be consideration of the government business order of the day relating to the Family Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment (Schoolkids Bonus Budget Measures) Bill 2012;
(b) the bill listed in paragraph (a) be considered under a limitation of time, and that the time allotted for all remaining stages be as follows: commencing at 12.30 pm until 1.50 pm; and
(c) paragraph (b) of this order operate as a limitation of debate under standing order 142.

Senator Ludlam to move:
That the Senate—
(a) notes:
(i) Burma's National League for Democracy (NLD) won 43 of the 45 seats contested in the April 2012 by-election,
(ii) Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and her NLD colleagues took their seats in the parliament on 2 May 2012,
(iii) that out of a total of 664 seats in the Burmese Parliament, the NLD holds 7 per cent, the military 25 per cent and the military-backed Union Solidarity and Development Party more than 50 per cent,
(iv) despite ballot irregularities and intimidations revealing the election not being entirely free and fair, sanctions on Burma were eased by the Australian Government as an incentive for further reform,
(v) the emphasis placed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Senator Bob Carr) on their reversibility of relaxed sanctions should reforms not progress,
(vi) up to 1 000 political prisoners remain in Burmese jails,
(vii) oil and gas revenues constitute the largest source of income for the regime, amounting to US$3 billion in the 2011-12 fiscal year, and
(viii) Australia's total two-way trade with Burma amounted to $93 million in 2010-11; and
(b) calls on the Australian Government to:
(i) ensure any normalisation of Australian trade and investment in Burma is reversible, and
(ii) adopt the United States of America model of normalising trade in sectors that will create jobs, build skills and have positive benefits for ordinary Burmese while maintaining sanctions on the mining and resource sectors that simply exploit Burma's unique natural resources, cause systematic human rights violations, loss of livelihoods and force people from their homes.

Senator Bernardi to move:
That the time for the presentation of the report of the Standing Committee of Senators' Interests on the development of a draft code of conduct for senators be extended to 27 November 2012.

CONDOLENCES
Adams, Senator Judith Anne
Senator FARRELL (South Australia—Parliamentary Secretary for Sustainability and Urban Water) (17:30): I move:
That, as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Judith Anne Adams, the Senate do now adjourn.
Question agreed to.

Senate adjourned at 17:30
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The following answers to questions were circulated:

Australia Network
(Question No. 543)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 25 March 2011:

(1) What is the target audience for the Australia Network, and was it determined by market research; if so, is this research publicly available.

(2) Has the department undertaken any studies to determine whether the Australia Network is reaching the determined target audience; if so: (a) when were the studies undertaken; and (b) what were the results.

(3) Did the department undertake a study of the Australia Network’s effectiveness before the Government announced that it would put out to tender a new 10 year contract.

(4) Does the department consider that television remains the best medium for reaching the determined target audience; if so, why.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 543 on 25 March 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Passports
(Question No. 929)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Was the Australian Government’s revenue from passport fees in the 2009-10 financial year equal to or greater than the cost of providing consular assistance.

Senator Bob Carr The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

Revenue received from passport fees was greater than the cost of providing consular assistance in 2009-10.

Australia Network
(Question No. 932)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Did the Minister receive a brief from the department seeking approval of text contained in the request for tender and/or associated documents in relation to Australia Network before their release, if so:

(1) When was the brief received by the Minister's office.
(2) When was brief sighted by the Minister.
(3) What type of ministerial action was requested by the department, and was it agreed to by the Minister.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 932 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Australia Network
(Question No. 933)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Did the Minister or any of his ministerial staff request changes to the text contained in the request for tender and/or associated documents in relation to Australia Network; if so, when, and what was the nature of the requested changes.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 933 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Australia Network
(Question No. 934)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Was the final version of the request for tender and associated documents in relation to Australia Network approved by Cabinet or the Minister; if so, when.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 934 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.
Australia Network
(Question No. 935)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Did the Minister or any of his ministerial staff receive a briefing, written or verbal, from the department or a member of the tender panel regarding any of the information provided by tenderers in their tender submissions in relation to Australia Network; if so, when and what was the nature of the information provided.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 935 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Australia Network
(Question No. 936)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

When did the tender panel in relation to Australia Network finalise its report and did it include a recommendation as to a preferred tenderer.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 936 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Australia Network
(Question No. 937)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Was it the panel's view that both tenderers met the requirements of the tender in relation to Australia Network.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 937 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes.
As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

**Australia Network**

(Question No. 938)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Did the Minister or any of his ministerial staff receive a briefing, written or verbal, from the Department or a member of the tender panel regarding the panel's progress in relation to the Australia Network tender.

**Senator Conroy:** The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 938 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

**Australia Network**

(Question No. 939)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

When was the tender panel's report in relation to Australia Network first sighted by the Secretary of the department.

**Senator Conroy:** The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 939 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

**Australia Network**

(Question No. 940)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Did the Minister or any of his ministerial staff receive a briefing, written or verbal, from the department regarding the tender panel's report and recommendation of a preferred tenderer in relation to the Australia Network tender:

(1) If so: (a) when was the brief received by the Minister's office; (b) when was the brief sighted by the Minister; and (c) what type of ministerial action was requested by the department, and was it agreed to by the Minister.

(2) If not, why not.
Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 940 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Australia Network
(Question No. 941)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

1. Did the department prepare a Cabinet submission detailing the tender panel's report and recommendation of a preferred tenderer in relation to the Australia Network tender; if so, when.

2. Was input into the brief provided by other governments; if so, which ones.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 941 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Australia Network
(Question No. 942)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

When was the department first notified of the Government's intention to extend the existing Australia Network contract, while additional information is sought from tenderers.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 942 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Australia Network
(Question No. 943)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Has the Minister or any of his ministerial staff received a briefing, written or verbal, from the department and/or consultants regarding the expansion of the Australia Network into the Middle East.
and North Africa and its impact on the Network's penetration rates in Asia and/or the Pacific; if so, when and what was the nature of this advice.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 943 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Australia Network
(Question No. 944)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

1) Prior to the Cabinet's consideration of the Australia Network tender, who was the designated decision-maker for the tender.

2) Assuming that the designated decision-maker was not Cabinet, on what legal basis was the decision-maker stripped of that role.

3) Prior to the former decision-maker being stripped of this role had a decision been made as to who would be the successful tenderer.

4) Who is now the decision-maker.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 944 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

Australia Network
(Question No. 945)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Has the Minister or any of his ministerial staff received a briefing, written or verbal, from the department and/or consultants regarding the additional costs associated with expanding the Australia Network's coverage into the Middle East and North Africa; if so, when and what was the nature of this advice and the additional cost.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 945 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes.
As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

**Australia Network**

**(Question No. 946)**

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Has the Minister or any of his ministerial staff received a briefing, written or verbal, from the department and/or consultants expressing their concerns about the change to the request for tender and/or association documentation in relation to Australia Network; if so, when and what was the nature of their concerns.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 946 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

**Australia Network**

**(Question No. 947)**

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Has the Minister or any of his staff and/or the department received any correspondence from, or had discussions with, any of the interested parties involved in the tender process in relation to Australia Network concerning the impact of the Government's decision on the financial viability of their proposal; if so, when and which parties were involved, and what was the nature of the correspondence and/or discussions.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 947 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

**Australia Network**

**(Question No. 948)**

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 18 August 2011:

Has the Minister or any of his ministerial staff and/or the department received correspondence from, or had discussions with, any of the interested parties involved in the tender process in relation to Australia Network since the Government's decision to seek further information; if so, when and which parties were involved, and what was the nature of the correspondence and/or discussions.
Senator Conroy: The Minister for Foreign Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

In the period since Senator Johnston submitted Question on Notice 948 on 18 August 2011, the Government terminated the Australia Network tender process and instituted an investigation by the Australian Federal Police due to leaks of confidential information. The Auditor-General has also decided to conduct a performance audit of the administration of the Australia Network tender processes. As the Questions on Notice go to matters being considered by the Australian Federal Police and Australian National Audit Office, it would not be appropriate to comment.

**Foreign Affairs and Trade**
*(Question No. 1231)*

Senator Rhiannon asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 21 September 2011:

Will a representative from AusAID or the Minister's office be attending the Global Microcredit Summit in Spain in November 2011: (a) if so, who will be attending the summit; and (b) if not, why is there no representative attending and what plans are in place for the Minister or AusAID to engage in the outcomes and learnings from the summit.

Senator Bob Carr: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

(a) AusAID was unable to attend the Global Microcredit Summit due to competing priorities at the time.

(b) A number of AusAID's microfinance partners participated in the Summit as panel members. These included the Consultative Group on Assisting the Poor; International Finance Corporation; Women's World Banking; United Nations Capital Development Fund; and the International Labour Organisation.

**Australian Communications and Media Authority**
*(Question No. 1255)*

Senator Birmingham asked the Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, upon notice, on 22 September 2011:

In regard to the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA):

(1) What is ACMA's total expenditure for the 2010-11 financial year on:

(a) advertising;
(b) travel (including a breakdown of business versus economy and domestic versus international);
(c) hospitality and entertainment;
(d) information and communications technology;
(e) consultancy;
(f) education/training to staff;
(g) external accounting;
(h) external auditing;
(i) external legal; and
(j) memberships or grants paid to affiliate organisations.

(2) Can a breakdown of the expenditure in (1) be provided for each division within the ACMA on:

(a) advertising;
(b) travel (including a breakdown of business versus economy and domestic versus international);
(c) hospitality and entertainment;
(d) information and communications technology;
(e) consultancy;
(f) education/training to staff;
(g) external accounting;
(h) external auditing;
(i) external legal; and
(j) memberships or grants paid to affiliate organisations.

(3) Within each divisional area, can a breakdown of expenditure be provided, for each Executive Manager on:

(a) advertising;
(b) travel (including a breakdown of business versus economy and domestic versus international);
(c) hospitality and entertainment;
(d) information and communications technology;
(e) consultancy;
(f) education/training to staff;
(g) external accounting;
(h) external auditing;
(i) external legal; and
(j) memberships or grants paid to affiliate organisations.

Senator Conroy: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

(1) to (3) The response to this question has been answered by Senate Estimates Questions on Notice 246-24

**Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy**

*(Question No. 1258)*

**Senator Birmingham** asked the Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, upon notice, on 22 September 2011:

(1) Can details be provided on total expenditure for the 2010-11 financial year for the department on:

(a) advertising;
(b) travel (including a breakdown of business versus economy and domestic versus international);
(c) hospitality and entertainment;
(d) information and communications technology;
(e) consultancy;
(f) education/training to staff;
(g) external accounting;
(h) external auditing;
(i) external legal; and
(j) memberships or grants paid to affiliate organisations.

(2) Can a breakdown of the expenditure in (1) be provided for each departmental group within the department on:

---
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(a) advertising;
(b) travel (including a breakdown of business versus economy and domestic versus international);
(c) hospitality and entertainment;
(d) information and communications technology;
(e) consultancy;
(f) education/training to staff;
(g) external accounting;
(h) external auditing;
(i) external legal; and
(j) memberships or grants paid to affiliate organisations.

(3) Within each divisional area, can a breakdown of expenditure be provided, for each Assistant Secretary on:
(a) advertising;
(b) travel (including a breakdown of business versus economy and domestic versus international);
(c) hospitality and entertainment;
(d) information and communications technology;
(e) consultancy;
(f) education/training to staff;
(g) external accounting;
(h) external auditing;
(i) external legal; and
(j) memberships or grants paid to affiliate organisations.

Senator Conroy: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

(1) to (3) The response to this question has been answered by Senate Estimates Questions on Notice 443-445 (the Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy).

Immigration and Citizenship

(Question No. 1295)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, upon notice, on 28 October 2011:

With reference to the answer to question no. BE11/0580 taken on notice during the 2011-12 Budget estimates of the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, how much notice was given in each category of person or persons listed in the answer.

Senator Lundy: The Minister for Immigration and Citizenship has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

With respect to the Premier of Tasmania, Lara Giddings, notification of the commissioning of the new immigration detention facility at Pontville in Tasmania was given by telephone a few days prior to the public announcement. The Minister attempted to contact the Mayor at Brighton the day before the announcement, but was not successful until the day of the announcement.

With respect to the remaining categories of person or persons listed in the response to BE11/0580, notification was given by telephone on 5 April 2011, approximately one hour prior to the Minister's announcement.
Future Fund
(Question No. 1516)

Senator Ludlam  asked the Minister for Finance and Deregulation, upon notice, on 19 January 2012:

(1) What is the current dollar value of equities owned or held in trust by the Future Fund; or funds under its management; or managed on behalf of the Future Fund by its investment managers, in each of the following companies:

(a) Alliant Techsystems Inc;
(b) The Babcock & Wilcox Company;
(c) Babcock International Group;
(d) BAE Systems;
(e) Bechtel Corporation;
(f) European Aeronautic Defence and Space Company (EADS);
(g) Finmeccanica;
(h) GenCorp Inc;
(i) General Dynamics;
(j) Goodrich Corporation;
(k) Honeywell International;
(l) ITT Corporation;
(m) Jacobs Engineering Group Inc;
(n) Larsen & Toubro Limited;
(o) Lockheed Martin Corporation;
(p) Northrop Grumman Corporation;
(q) Redhall Group;
(r) Rockwell Collins;
(s) Rolls-Royce;
(t) Safran Group;
(u) Serco Group; and
(v) Thales Group.

(2) Can a list be provided detailing the nations whose nuclear weapons programs the Future Fund considers to be: (a) legitimate; and (b) illegitimate.

(3) Does the Future Fund consider India's nuclear weapons programs to be legitimate.

(4) On what basis does the Future Fund consider it unacceptable to invest in companies that manufacture cluster munitions and anti-personnel landmines, but acceptable to investment in those that manufacture nuclear weapons.

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

(1) The Future Fund Management Agency has advised that the value of the Future Fund's holdings in the companies in question as at 19 January 2012 was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliant Techsystems Inc</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Babcock &amp; Wilcox Company</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babcock International Group</td>
<td>$127,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) BAE Systems; $2,222,733
(e) Bechtel Corporation; $0
(f) European Aeronautic Defence and Space Company; $1,757,321
(g) Fimmeccanica; $0
(h) GenCorp Inc; $0
(i) General Dynamics; $0
(j) Goodrich Corporation; $1,286,207
(k) Honeywell International; $96,986,221
(l) ITT Corporation; $0
(m) Jacobs Engineering Group Inc; $586,237
(n) Larsen & Toubro Limited; $3,305,949
(o) Lockheed Martin Corporation; $0
(p) Northrop Grumman Corporation; $2,292,481
(q) Redhall Group; $0
(r) Rockwell Collins; $15,429,979
(s) Rolls-Royce; $1,766,436
(t) Safran Group; $713,731
(u) Serco Group; and $119,253
(v) Thales Group. $264,972

(2) No, the Future Fund Board of Guardians does not make its investment decisions based on such a consideration. The Board's investment decisions are based on the requirements of the Future Fund Act 2006 and the Nation-building Funds Act 2008, the risk and return requirements of the mandate and the application of the Fund's investment strategy, policies and processes. The Board considers Australia's obligations under the international conventions and treaties it has ratified. These are explained in the Board's Statement of Investment Policies, which includes a policy on managing environmental, social and governance (ESG) issues.

(3) See response to Question 2.

(4) In applying the framework to its investment decisions, the Board first considers the activities of an entity or funding activity and then considers whether an investment is consistent with its policies. Where the Board becomes aware that the activities of an entity or funding activity may contravene an international treaty ratified by Australia, the Board will consider the exclusion or removal of the investment from the portfolio.

**Pontville Detention Centre**

*(Question No. 1524)*

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, upon notice, on 31 January 2012:

With reference to the Pontville Immigration Detention Centre:

(1) How many ambulance visits have there been to the detention centre since it was opened.
(2) How many ambulance visits have been necessitated for the treatment of detainees.
(3) Who bears the cost of ambulance visits to the detention centre.
(4) For what types of medical emergency were the ambulances required.
(5) In regard to the reported hunger strike:
   (a) how many detainees have been on a hunger strike at any one time;
   (b) how many have required hospitalisation or on-site medical treatment as a result of a hunger strike;
(c) on what date did the first hunger strike take place and how many participated in that hunger strike; and
(d) what was the basis of the hunger strike.

(6) Given that it has been claimed that certain representations were made to detainees as to community detention and the processing of their applications, can the Minister confirm that no such representations were made by departmental officials or Serco staff; if so, what advice can be provided as to the source of misapprehensions under which the detainees suffered in relation to community detention and the expeditious processing of their applications.

(7) Are the detainees taken on day trips; if so:
(a) how many day trips have been undertaken; and
(b) can a list be provided detailing those day trips, including:
(i) the location, for example, visits to the zoo or cinema, and
(ii) the associated costs.

Senator Lundy: The Minister for Immigration and Citizenship has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) As at 07 February 2012, there have been 11 people transferred from Pontville Immigration Detention Centre (PVIDC) to Royal Hobart Hospital (RHH) by ambulance since the facility became operational on 01 September 2011. Of those, three were Serco staff.

(2) There have been 8 detainees transferred from PVIDC to RHH by ambulance since the facility became operational.

(3) The cost of ambulance visits to the centre is passed on by the Service Provider 'International Health and Medical Services' to the department.

(4) There were four types of medical emergencies that have required ambulance support:
(a) medical complaint
(b) complaints of chest pains
(c) cases of suspected pneumonia
(d) clients collapsing due to various medical conditions

(5) (a) The largest number of clients that have been classified as being on voluntary starvation over 24 hours at any one time is eight people in detention. These clients were all participating in separate voluntary starvation protests, for reasons personal to themselves.

There are no recorded incidents of group voluntary starvation protest at PVIDC.

(b) No clients required hospitalisation as a result of voluntary starvation action. People who are classified as being on Voluntary Starvation are monitored by service provider agencies onsite at PVIDC, including daily interaction with health service providers. Health service providers engage with clients, may take observations of health indicators and may provide treatment for certain conditions such as dehydration. In this sense all clients on Voluntary Starvation received medical treatment or attention as part of monitoring their health and well-being.

(c) The first recorded incident of a person in detention being classified as participating in voluntary starvation over 24 hours occurred on 19 September 2011 with only one client involved in this incident.

(d) The reason a person in detention participates in a voluntary starvation protest is their own and often varies from person to person.

(6) All clients accommodated at the PVIDC had already received information about the Community Detention program prior to transfer.
Departmental Case Managers at PVIDC (as at all Immigration Detention Facilities) are responsible for facilitating the progression of clients towards resolution of their immigration status. This involves addressing any obstacles which may be delaying such outcomes. Other actions may also entail initiation and submission of appropriate referrals, including referral to the Community Detention program.

Many clients at PVIDC were referred for consideration under the Community Detention program prior to being transferred to the centre. Clients who arrived at PVIDC without Community Detention referrals in place have subsequently had referrals initiated if it was believed they would meet eligibility criteria.

Departmental procedures ensure Case Managers regularly review each client. Further, Case Managers meet with all clients regularly to address any client concerns and deliver updates on case progression.

(7) (a) There have been a total of 307 trips for people in detention.
(b) List of trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>No. of Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Gardens</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonorong Park</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Ponds</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mens Shed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCYC</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynwald Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoodoo</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callington Mill</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Memorial (Art)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Wellington</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Bowls</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart City</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orford</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) The associated cost of excursions are included as a fixed price in the total cost of the detention services contract. The Department is unable to separately identify these costs.
Health
(Question No. 1531)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 3 February 2012:

(1) What communication (verbal or written) took place between the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) and the departmental Secretary, Ms Jane Halton, in the lead up to the CEO commissioning a literature review on the subject of naltrexone implants.

(2) Given that the CEO of NHMRC states in a letter to Western Australian MLA Peter Abetz that the Secretary asked him to prepare the naltrexone literature review, did the Minister have any communication with the Secretary seeking such a review.

(3) Prior to the document 'Naltrexone implant treatment for opioid dependence – Literature Review' being made public on the NHMRC website, did the Minister's office have any communication with any officer of NHMRC concerning the content of the review.

(4) Did the Minister or his staff make any representation to any staff or officials of NHMRC requesting that there be no naltrexone experts in the group established to examine the literature relating to naltrexone implants.

(5) Does the Minister condone the failure by NHMRC to follow its own guidelines, in particular, when it failed to: (a) involve any active naltrexone experts in the review process; and (b) identify any authors or reviewers of the literature review, particularly given that the NHMRC website states in the 'Joint NHMRC/AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice (1997)' document, 'Any part of an article critical to its main conclusion must be the responsibility of at least one author. An author's role in a research output must be sufficient for that person to take public responsibility for at least that part of the output in that person's area of expertise'.

(6) Who made the decision to first place, and then keep, the naltrexone literature review in the guidelines section of the NHMRC website given that it is clearly not a guidelines document.

(7) Given that Professor Gary Hulse of the University of Western Australia found that the use of naltrexone implants resulted in a reduction of opioid overdoses (from 21 in the 6 months prior to insertion of naltrexone implants to 0 in the 6 months after insertion): (a) on what basis did the NHMRC reviewers come to the conclusion that this was not statistically significant, particularly when Professor Hulse and others assert that this is significant at the P<0.0001 level; (b) can the name of the person who contributed the opinion to the review that the result was not statistically significant be provided; and (c) will the Minister instruct NHMRC to have an expert check if Professor Hulse's work is statistically significant.

(8) With reference to statements made by Ms Halton during the 2008-09 Budget estimates hearing of the Community Affairs Committee on 22 October 2008, in particular, that Dr George O'Neil had no interest in good manufacturing practice (GMP) despite Dr O'Neil lodging his first GMP applications in 2003 and 2004 and being granted a GMP licence in 2005, from what source was this information gathered.

(9) Why were no Australian or international experts on naltrexone or naltrexone implants consulted or involved in the production of the NHMRC literature review.

(10) Did Dr Alex Wodak have any involvement in the: (a) request for a literature review on naltrexone implants; (b) writing of the review; (c) peer reviewing of this literature review.

(11) Given that Professor Philipp Lobmaier of the Norwegian Centre for Addiction Research, regarded as the most eminent world authority on naltrexone implants, has described the NHMRC literature review as being in the category of an 'ideologically motivated position paper', will the
Minister urge NHMRC to withdraw this document until a full inquiry into the irregularities in its production has been made public.

(12) Can the Minister assure the public that all future literature reviews published on the NHMRC website will be produced in keeping with its protocols.

(13) Will the Minister ensure that NHMRC submits the literature review to world experts for revision as a matter of urgency.

(14) How long will the Minister tolerate the continuing display of this flawed document on the NHMRC website.

Senator Ludwig: The Minister for Health has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) This was previously responded to at the Senate Estimates Hearing on 20 October 2011. Available at the following link:

(2) No.

(3) As per standard practice for all externally released documents, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) informed the Minister of its intention to publish the Literature Review of Naltrexone Implants on the NHMRC website.

(4) No.

(5) (a) The objective of the literature review was to assess the evidence relating to the use of naltrexone implants for opioid dependence in clinical practice. As such expertise was sought in the areas of clinical practice, evidence based medicine, addiction, pain management and pharmacological regulation.

(b) The Joint NHMRC/AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice (1997) was rescinded in 2007 and replaced with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007) which is explicitly applicable to research, not the development of health care advice, such as literature reviews by officials.

(6) The Chief Executive Officer of NHMRC authorised the placement of the literature review under the main Guidelines tab. It is current practice that all NHMRC publications are listed under the main Guidelines tab on NHMRC Home Page which, when accessed, provides a very clear explanation that the material on the website includes publications as well as guidelines.

(7) (a) This question has already been answered. Please refer to a previous response provided by the then Minister for Health and Ageing, the Hon Nicola Roxon MP, Senate Question Number S11000910 published on 19 September, 2011.

(b) NHMRC advises that the 'Naltrexone implant treatment for opioid dependence–Literature Review' (Literature Review) was drafted by staff of the Office of NHMRC. The Executive Director representing this work is Professor John McCallum.

(c) The NHMRC is an independent, expert scientific body which is well placed to advise government and the community on health issues.

(8) During the budget estimates hearing of the Community Affairs Committee on 22 October 2008, Ms Halton informed the committee that the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) and Dr O'Neil had engaged in a 'very long conversation about the need to ensure that, if he is manufacturing, he meets good manufacturing practice.'
On 4 May 2011, the TGA imposed conditions on the manufacturing licence for Dr O'Neil's company 'Go Medical' which prevent further manufacturing at his Selby Street site as a result of safety and quality concerns.

(9) The objective of the literature review was to assess the evidence relating to the use of naltrexone implants for opioid dependence in clinical practice. As such, expertise was sought in the areas of clinical practice, evidence based medicine, addiction, pain management and pharmacological regulation.

(10) (a) No. For your information, please refer to a previous answer provided by the then Minister for Health and Ageing, the Hon Nicola Roxon MP, to Parliamentary Question on Notice R09000613 published on 12 May 2009.*

(b) No.

(c) Yes.

(11) The NHMRC is an independent, expert scientific body which is well placed to advise government and the community on health issues.

(12) Yes.

(13) No. The NHMRC is an independent, expert scientific body which is well placed to advise government and the community on health issues.

(14) The Minister has confidence in NHMRC as an independent, expert scientific body which is well placed to advise government and the community on health issues.

Asylum Seekers
(Question No. 1533)

Senator Cash asked the Minister for Finance and Deregulation, upon notice, on 6 February 2012:

What is the whole of government budget, across all portfolios, for intercepting, transferring, housing, processing (including administrative and judicial review) and removing asylum seekers in the: (a) 2010-11; and (b) 2011-12 (to date), financial years.

Senator Wong: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

Under the budget framework, funds are appropriated to separate portfolios, and there is no whole of government budget for asylum seekers. The estimates of appropriations for intercepting, transferring, housing, processing (including administrative and judicial review) and removing asylum seekers can be found in the following Portfolio Budget Statements:

- Attorney-General's Portfolio
- Defence Portfolio
- Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio

Seasonal Worker Program
(Question No. 1535)

Senator Cash asked the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations, upon notice, on 6 February 2012:

With reference to the Seasonal Worker Program announced by the Government on 18 December 2011:

(1) How will the $21.7 million allocated to the program be spent, and where will this funding come from.
(2) How does the Seasonal Worker Program differ from the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme.

(3) Which countries are included in the:
(a) Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme; and
(b) Seasonal Worker Program.

(4) Can copies of all signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) relating to the Seasonal Worker Program be provided.

(5) In regard to Nauru and Tuvalu, detailed separately:
(a) what is the current state of discussions in relation to an MOU;
(b) when did discussions commence; and
(c) when is the MOU expected to be signed.

(6) Was an evaluation report completed for the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme; if so, can a copy be provided; if not, why not.

(7) Can details be provided of the 'small scale, three year trial arrangements with cotton and cane growers, aquaculture ventures and accommodation providers in the tourism industry', including how these industries were selected to be part of the trial.

(8) What selection criteria are employers required to satisfy in order to be an 'approved employer'.

(9) How many applications by companies seeking to be an 'approved employer' have been: (a) received; (b) approved; and (c) denied, including the reason(s) for denial.

Senator Ludwig: The Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) The funding allocated to the Seasonal Worker Program will be spent on administering the program, technical and capacity building assistance for countries participating in the Seasonal Worker Program, and financial literacy training and other training to support seasonal workers' effective participation in the Program. Funding of $21.7 million has been allocated, which is offset from relevant departments and agencies as well as from Official Development Assistance funds.

(2) The Seasonal Worker Program differs from the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme in the following ways:
- The Program will be an ongoing program for horticulture businesses—it will not be a trial.
- It will trial seasonal labour mobility arrangements with accommodation, aquaculture, cane and cotton businesses in selected regions.
- Its governance arrangements will be streamlined.
- The process for selecting employers to participate in the Program will also differ. Employers must enter into a special program agreement with the Department of Immigration and Citizenship and then apply to become a special program sponsor.

(3) (a) East Timor, Kiribati, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu have been invited to participate in the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme. (b) East Timor, Kiribati, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu have been invited to participate in the Seasonal Worker Program.

(4) MOU for the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme between the Australian Government and the governments of East Timor, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu have been signed. The text of these MOU is available at:

(5) Discussions with the governments of Nauru and Tuvalu commenced following the
Prime Minister's announcement of the expansion of the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme in September 2011. The Australian Government and the government of Tuvalu signed an MOU for the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme in early March 2012. As of 16 March 2012, discussions with the government of Nauru for the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme are continuing.

(6) An evaluation report on the development impacts of the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme has been completed. The report is available at: http://ideas.repec.org/p/wai/econwp/11-09.html. An evaluation report on the domestic impacts of the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme is nearing completion.

(7) The trial with accommodation, aquaculture, cane and cotton growers will be implemented in selected regions, determined in consultation with key stakeholders. The industries were selected for the trial element of the Seasonal Worker Program given a range of factors, including seasonality, labour force information, expressions of interest from industry, and linkages with economic activity in participating countries.

(8) The selection criteria can be found in the Request for Expression of Interest Form at: http://www.deewr.gov.au/Employment/Programs/PSWPS/Pages/ApprovedEmployers.aspx.

(9) As of Friday 16 March 2012, the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations has received applications from 61 separate entities seeking to become an Approved Employer. Of these applications:
- Two applications have been withdrawn by the entity seeking to become an Approved Employer.
- 15 applications did not meet one or more selection criteria and these entities were not invited to become an Approved Employer under the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme.
- 20 applications are under assessment.
- 24 entities have been invited to become an Approved Employer under the Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme.

National Resources Sector Employment Taskforce
(Question Nos 1537 and 1538)

Senator Cash asked the Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills, Science and Research and the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations, upon notice, on 6 February 2012:

Can an update be provided as to the status of each of the 31 recommendations presented by the National Resources Sector Employment Taskforce.

Senator Chris Evans: On behalf of both ministers, the answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

An Implementation Plan for the 31 recommendations of the National Resources Sector Workforce Strategy (NRSWS) has been developed by industry and government stakeholders and is available on the NRSWS website at www.deewr.gov.au/resourcesworkforce.

Progress updates about significant implementation achievements are also being published on the website as they become available. The December 2011 update has information on:
- the Workforce Impact Statement template being piloted in 2012-13,
- Skills Australia's annual updates on resources sector skills needs,
- take-up of adult apprenticeships,
- release of guidelines for Enterprise Migration Agreements,
appointment of a FIFO Coordinator in Cairns,
launch of the Australian Women in Resources Alliance,
progress of MOUs on Indigenous Employment and Enterprise Development,
launch of the OresomeResources website for teachers,
release of the WA Affordable Housing Strategy, and
initiatives in the Northern Territory under the Territory 2030 strategy.

Immigration and Citizenship
(Question No. 1540)

Senator Cash asked the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, upon notice, on 8 February 2012:

(1) Following a letter dated 17 March 2011 from the Minister to the Member for Forrest, which stated that 'My Department, together with a number of other Government agencies, is currently reviewing the issues faced by individuals remaining in Australia long term as temporary residents. In this context concerns raised by Retirement visa holders, and possible options for resolution, are being given due consideration':

(a) has any continuing work been undertaken by the department in relation to this matter; if so, can details of this work be provided; and

(b) what further work is planned by the department.

(2) Has the department accepted the feasibility of any of the 'alternative scenarios' of the Australian Government Actuary (AGA) report into the estimated costs of 410 retirement visa holders gaining a pathway to permanent residence; if so, which scenarios.

(3) How has the AGA report been used since its publication to 'help inform Government discussions', as mentioned in a letter from the department to British ExPat Retirees in Australia (BERIA) in June 2010.

(4) What feedback has the department received on the issue of permanent residence for 410 retirement visa holders from 'other Government agencies, retirement visa holders and their representatives, including organisations such as BERIA', as mentioned in a letter from the department to BERIA in June 2010.

Senator Lundy: The Minister for Immigration and Citizenship has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) (a) Yes, my Department is continuing to contribute to work on this issue with a range of other agencies as any decision to alter arrangements for long term temporary residents may have significant cost implications across portfolios. Decisions regarding this matter would need to be considered by Government in a budget context. As the work is continuing I am unable to provide details of the Department's work.

(b) The Department will continue to work with other agencies to advise the Government on this matter.

(2) The Department would not presume to question the professional opinion of the Australian Government Actuary (AGA) by making judgements about the feasibility or otherwise of the alternative scenarios costed.

The report summarises work undertaken by the AGA to develop a model of the potential direct costs to the Commonwealth of providing permanent residence to Retirement visa holders after 10 years on the visa and discusses the various assumptions used in developing this model. As stated in the report,
various scenarios were included in order to demonstrate the sensitivity of outcomes with slightly different assumptions in relation to health cost inflation and mortality.

(3) As indicated in a letter sent to BERIA in June 2011, this report was one of many sources of information used to inform discussions about development of a pathway to permanent residence for these visa holders. For example, this report enabled staff in my Department to develop a better understanding of the factors to be taken into account in developing a costing, the basis for various assumptions and the relative sensitivity of outcomes to changes in these assumptions.

(4) In addition to an alternative costing model developed by BERIA the Government did receive some feedback from Retirement visa holders and their supporters concerned at what they perceived as issues or deficiencies with the report. For example, concerns were raised over not including scenarios which used various alternative assumptions regarding the take-up rate of permanent residence. This was, however, considered unnecessary as indicative figures could be calculated using the modelling outcomes without the need for this work to be undertaken by the AGA.

Pontville Detention Centre
(Question No. 1547)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, upon notice, on 9 February 2012:

Per month, what is the total cost incurred through the use of hire cars associated with the Pontville Immigration Detention Centre.

Senator Lundy: The Minister for Immigration and Citizenship has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

The cost per month for the lease of four (4) cars for use by departmental staff at the Pontville Immigration Detention Centre is $5,447 GST exclusive.

A total of $29,414 GST exclusive has been incurred from August 2011 to February 2012. Of this, $2,178 has been incurred in the lead up to the Pontville opening and for a few weeks while Leaseplan vehicles were being organised.

Foreign Affairs and Trade
(Question No. 1551)

Senator Birmingham asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 15 February 2012:

With reference to the International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative:

(1) Can a list be provided detailing all grants provided to the Government of Kiribati under the initiative, including the purpose of each grant.

(2) Have any of these grants been provided for national summits; if so, can details be provided, including:

(a) when the summit took place;
(b) the total number of attendees;
(c) the names of those who participated;
(d) the outcomes of the summit;
(e) whether Australia sent facilitators; and
(f) whether reports were provided to the Australian Government.
Senator Bob Carr: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

(1) Under the International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative, the following two grants have been provided to the Government of Kiribati:

(i) $250,000 to support the national summit on the Kiribati National Climate Change Framework.

The Government of Kiribati requested support from Australia to hold consultations on their National Climate Change Framework, which was provided by the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (DCCEE) in conjunction with AusAID.

(ii) $51,000 to support attendance at the Kiribati side event at the 15th Conference of Parties (COP15) to the United National Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Copenhagen in November and December 2009.

The side event provided an opportunity for the Government of Kiribati to influence the international climate change debate by raising awareness of the challenges faced by island nations like Kiribati. It also provided a forum for sharing knowledge and lessons learned by the Government of Kiribati through implementation of their climate change adaptation programs.

(2) Yes, for the national summit on the Kiribati National Climate Change Framework, as outlined in response (1)(i) above.

(a) 16-20 May 2011.
(b) Approximately 300 people attended.
(c) Attendees included representatives from the majority of Kiribati's outer islands, consisting of community leaders and officials, non-government and faith-based organisation representatives, women and youth. The President of Kiribati, HE Anote Tong, opened the summit. An official from DCCEE was invited and attended three days of the summit. AusAID officials from Australia's High Commission in Kiribati were present.
(d) The summit informed the development of the draft National Climate Change Framework and the next Kiribati Development Plan 2012-2015, which are currently subject to approval by the Government of Kiribati. The summit increased awareness and understanding about climate change, and how it relates to existing development priorities. Australia's assistance also enabled the development of Island Resilience Reports, in both English and Kiribati, which will assist island communities in identifying climate change impacts and adaptation measures.
(e) The Kiribati Office of the President invited an official from DCCEE to attend the summit. The DCCEE representative assisted in preparations for the summit.
(f) The Government of Kiribati has provided a post-activity report to DCCEE.

Climate Change
(Question No. 1552)

Senator Birmingham asked the Minister representing the Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, upon notice, on 15 February 2012:

With reference to the International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative:

(1) Can a list be provided detailing all grants provided to the Government of Kiribati under the initiative, including the purpose of each grant.

(2) Have any of these grants been provided for national summits; if so, can details be provided, including:

(a) when the summit took place;
(b) the total number of attendees;
(c) the names of those who participated;
(d) the outcomes of the summit;
(e) whether Australia sent facilitators; and
(f) whether reports were provided to the Australian Government.

Senator Wong: The Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) Under the International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative, the following two grants have been provided to the Government of Kiribati:

(i) $250,000 to support the national summit on the Kiribati National Climate Change Framework.

The Government of Kiribati requested support from Australia to hold consultations on their National Climate Change Framework, which was provided by the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (DCCEE) in conjunction with AusAID.

(ii) $51,000 to support attendance at the Kiribati side event at the 15th Conference of Parties (COP15) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Copenhagen in November and December 2009.

The side event provided an opportunity for the Government of Kiribati to influence the international climate change debate by raising awareness of the challenges faced by island nations like Kiribati. It also provided a forum for sharing knowledge and lessons learned by the Government of Kiribati through implementation of their climate change adaptation programs.

(2) Yes, for the national summit on the Kiribati National Climate Change Framework, as outlined in response (1)(i) above.

(a) 16-20 May 2011.
(b) Approximately 300 people attended.
(c) Attendees included representatives from the majority of Kiribati's outer islands, consisting of community leaders and officials, non-government and faith-based organisation representatives, women and youth. The President of Kiribati, HE Anote Tong, opened the summit. An official from DCCEE was invited and attended three days of the summit. AusAID officials from Australia's High Commission in Kiribati were present.
(d) The summit informed the development of the draft National Climate Change Framework and the next Kiribati Development Plan 2012-15, which are currently subject to approval by the Government of Kiribati. The summit increased awareness and understanding about climate change, and how it relates to existing development priorities. Australia's assistance also enabled the development of Island Resilience Reports, in both English and Kiribati, which will assist island communities in identifying climate change impacts and adaptation measures.
(e) The Kiribati Office of the President invited an official from DCCEE to attend the summit. The DCCEE representative assisted in preparations for the summit.
(f) The Government of Kiribati has provided a post-activity report to DCCEE.

Australian Customs and Border Protection Service

(Question No. 1556)

Senator Birmingham asked the Minister representing the Minister for Home Affairs, upon notice, on 15 February 2012:

(1) Can details be provided of all resources committed by the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service, as well as known contributions from other agencies, towards the return to Australia of three protesters who boarded the Japanese vessel Shonan Maru No. 2 in January 2012.
(2) What was the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service's total expenditure on this exercise.

**Senator Ludwig:** The Minister for Home Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) The Australian Customs and Border Protection Vessel *Ocean Protector* was tasked to divert from its fisheries enforcement patrol to retrieve the three activists and transfer them to the mainland. This operation lasted for nine days. The Agency fulfilled its role using existing Customs and Border Protection staff who are dedicated on an ongoing basis to maritime surveillance and response activities. Customs and Border Protection does not have details about other agencies contributions.

(2) The retrieval had direct additional costs to Customs and Border Protection of $155,000. This included costs for fuel, berthing and support services. This is in addition to the normal operating costs of the ACV *Ocean Protector* during the nine-day period, which were approximately $906,000. Due to the retrieval, nine days were lost to Customs and Border Protection in their fisheries enforcement patrol in the Southern Ocean.

**Radiocommunications**

(Question No. 1557)

**Senator Ludlam** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, upon notice, on 16 February 2012:

With reference to the Radiocommunications Class Licence for wireless audio devices:

(1) Once a decision has been made in respect to changes to the class licence, how would typical users of wireless audio equipment, such as a teacher, priest, aerobics instructor, guitarist or small businessperson, find out exactly what spectrum the device they own uses.

(2) Based on the department's current modelling, how many wireless audio devices will become:

(a) non-compliant with the class licence; and

(b) unusable due to digital restack.

(3) Does the department have any advice as to whether there will be sufficient new stock of compliant wireless audio devices in Australia to replace all of the non-compliant devices prior to the switchover date.

(4) What is the expected economic impact on Australia if the current fleet of wireless audio devices is not replaced.

(5) What will the typical user's options be if their wireless audio device is no longer compliant.

(6) What kind of compliance action would typical users of wireless audio equipment be open to if they fail to replace their non-compliant equipment prior to the amendment of the class licence.

(7) Has the department increased its budget for compliance enforcement in respect to wireless audio devices for the period following the changeover date.

*Transferred to the Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, on 22 February 2012.*

**Senator Conroy:** The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) Information about the frequency or frequencies used by a given device is typically listed in the product specifications on product packaging, or in a product's instruction manual. Details and technical specifications for many devices are also available online, including on manufacturers' websites, or by contacting the manufacturer(s) directly.
The Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) has developed a website, available at www.acma.gov.au/WEB/STANDARD/pc=PC_312475, specifically designed to assist wireless audio device users in understanding the frequencies their devices currently operate within, and those they will be required to operate within the future. It is updated regularly, and wireless audio device users are encouraged to visit the website. Contact details for further assistance are also available on the website.

(2) (a) and (b) The usability and compliance of wireless audio devices will be dependent on the frequencies in which they operate post-restack. The restack planning process is underway. The frequencies that will be used following restack have not been finalised, and the amount of change that will occur cannot be quantified.

(3) It is the ACMA’s usual practice to communicate upcoming changes to licensing arrangements well in advance of anticipated variations, so that manufacturers are able to provide equipment in good time for new arrangements to come into effect.

Once the restack planning process is complete, the Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy will meet with equipment manufacturers to discuss the availability of wireless audio devices compliant with anticipated variations to the Radiocommunications Class Licence (Low Interference Potential Devices) 2000 (the ‘LIPD class licence’).

(4) As noted in the answer to Question 2 (above), the frequencies that will be used following restack have not been finalised, and the amount of change that will occur as a result of this decision cannot be quantified.

(5) The ACMA advises that when anticipated variations to the LIPD class licence come into effect, users of existing wireless microphone systems will be required to retune their devices to operate within the new frequency range(s), replace their existing equipment with devices compatible with the new frequency range(s), or cease transmission.

(6) Prior to amendments to the LIPD class licence, users of existing wireless microphone devices may choose to retune or replace their existing equipment, in anticipation of changes to the LIPD class licence coming into effect.

Should non-compliant wireless devices remain in operation after amendments to the LIPD class licence take effect, compliance enforcement action is handled by the ACMA in accordance with a ‘complaints based’ approach, initiated upon ACMA receipt of a formal complaint. In response to a complaint, the ACMA can take a number of actions including issuing a request to cease transmission.

(7) The ACMA is the agency responsible for radiofrequency spectrum compliance and enforcement activities, and will maintain this capability going forward. The Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy is not funded to undertake this activity.

Austalian Taxation Office

(Question No. 1559)

Senator Cormann asked the Minister representing the Treasurer, upon notice, on 17 February 2012:

(1) For each of the financial years 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and for the period 1 July 2011 to 1 February 2012:

(a) how many private ruling applications has the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) received;

(b) how many private rulings were approved;

(c) can a breakdown be provided detailing the private ruling applications in terms of small business, large business and individuals;

(d) can a breakdown be provided detailing the private ruling applications by state;

(e) how many applications have been resolved within:
(i) 28 days, and
(ii) 60 days; and
(f) how many bankruptcy, insolvency and receivership proceedings have been instigated by the ATO.

(2) Is the ATO limiting payment plans to 2 years; if so, why.

Senator Wong: The Treasurer has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) (a) Private ruling applications received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Received*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>11,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>10,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>9,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 (to 31 Jan)</td>
<td>4,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of private ruling applications received are indicative numbers only as:

An application may be initially classified as a private ruling but may then be reclassified as another type (for example, interpretative guidance) or visa versa. The misclassification generally arises for requests that come in via general correspondence rather than via the ATO private rulings form.

A private ruling application may come in via a tax agent and be counted as one receipt. However, if the application contains the details of multiple taxpayers it can be actioned as multiple applications.

Multiple applications received from entities of a corporate group can be actioned as one application.

An application received from a family business could be actioned separately for the company and individual directors.

(b) Private rulings approved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>7,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>5,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>5,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 (to 31 Jan)</td>
<td>3,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved rulings are rulings that have been approved by an authorised officer before being issued and do not include private ruling applications that were finalised as withdrawn, decline to rule, invalid or no further action.

Further description:

Withdrawn – application withdrawn at taxpayer's discretion

Refuse to rule – the Commissioner declines to rule based on reasons as defined by legislation, for example, prejudice or undue restriction on the administration of taxation law

Invalid – the application did not meet the requirements of a valid application, for example, it did not identify the entity to whom the ruling applies. The ATO assists taxpayers to make a valid application wherever possible

No further action – various reasons, for example, other guidance products may have been provided to satisfy the request or a request may have been incorrectly classified as a ruling.

(c) Private ruling applications finalised by market segment (micro, small and medium, large):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Micro</th>
<th>Small &amp; Medium Business</th>
<th>Large Business</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>7,663</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>11,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Table includes all private ruling cases (including cases that are withdrawn, decline to rule, invalid or no further action).

* Micro enterprises = businesses with an annual turnover under $2 million.

** Small and medium enterprises = business with an annual turnover of $2 million to $250 million.

*** Large businesses = corporate groups with an annual turnover above $250 million.

****Includes Not For Profit and Government

Table includes all private ruling cases. Table includes all private ruling cases (including cases that are withdrawn, decline to rule, invalid or no further action).

*Unknowns are overseas clients or those not yet in the Australian tax system (for example, minors).

**State break downs are not available for 2008-09 from the legacy case management system.

Table includes all private ruling cases. Table includes all private ruling cases (including cases that are withdrawn, decline to rule, invalid or no further action).

*Unknowns are overseas clients or those not yet in the Australian tax system (for example, minors).

**State break downs are not available for 2008-09 from the legacy case management system.

(e) Private ruling applications finalised by requestor's state:

(f) The numbers of personal bankruptcies and company wind-ups initiated by the ATO:

These figures represent the number of bankruptcies and wind-ups initiated by the ATO. They do not include instances where the ATO commenced bankruptcy or wind-up proceedings which were...
subsequently discontinued. For example, where the taxpayer makes a significant payment or enters into a satisfactory payment plan.

The ATO takes a balanced approach to managing debt based on a consideration of taxpayers' individual circumstances, including their lodgment and payment history and capacity to pay. The ATO supports and assists taxpayers willing to work with the ATO, while taking a firm approach in relation to those taxpayers who do not.

Business viability is an important consideration in determining the appropriate collection action.

As a result of the focus on business viability, ATO initiated wind-ups have increased. However they still represent only a small proportion of total wind-ups and the decision to initiate wind-up action is only taken after other courses of action have been exhausted.

The ATO has not instigated any receivership proceedings in 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 or 2011-12 as at 31 Jan 2012.

(2) Is the ATO limiting payment plans to 2 years; if so, why?

The ATO is not limiting payment plans to two years. The terms of any payment plan, including its length, are negotiated by the ATO and the taxpayer (or their authorised representative) based on a consideration of the taxpayer's individual circumstances.

Attorney-General's
(Question No. 1560)

Senator Siewert asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 17 February 2012:

Given that on 5 January 2012 Terrance Briscoe, an Aboriginal man, died in the Alice Springs watch-house after being arrested for drunkenness, and that the investigation into his death is being carried out by the Northern Territory Coroner, Greg Cavanagh, while the police are responsible for collecting all evidence and witness statements:

(1) Is the Minister aware of: (a) calls for an independent investigation into the death of Terrence Briscoe while in police custody; and (b) a letter sent to the Minister on 2 February 2012.

(2) Is the Minister aware that in Queensland, following three inquests into the death of Mulrunji Doomadgee, the Coroner rather than the police now investigates deaths in custody.

(3) Will the Minister commit to ensuring that investigations into deaths in custody will no longer be undertaken by police where police are involved.

(4) Is the Minister aware that, 20 years after the release of the report of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, the majority of the Royal Commission's recommendations have not been fully implemented; if so, what does the Minister intend to do to address this.

Senator Ludwig: The Attorney-General has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question.

Investigation of deaths in custody is the responsibility of the coroner's court and investigation teams within police and corrective services within each jurisdiction. I am not in a position to comment on individual cases.

I am aware that there have been calls for an independent investigation into the death in custody of Mr Briscoe. However, this is a decision for the Northern Territory Government. I received a letter on 2 February 2012 from the National Police Accountability Network of the National Association for Community Legal Centres on this issue, to which I am responding.

My Department has agreed to participate in a survey of the implementation of the Royal Commission's recommendations across jurisdictions, being lead by the NSW Aboriginal Legal Service
(ALS). The NSW ALS is expected to release its findings in the near future. A special edition of the Australian Indigenous Law Review (which is financially supported by AGD) is being published in 2012 on the 20th Anniversary of the Royal Commission. I understand that it will include articles from a range of contributors on the impact of the Royal Commission and the issues it raised. My Department will consider the findings of both of these reviews once they are released.

World Heritage Areas  
(Question No. 1561)

Senator Waters asked the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, upon notice, on 23 February 2012:

With reference to the Gondwana Rainforests of Australia World Heritage Area:

(1) On what grounds was the classification of World Heritage not deemed to be a controlling provision for the Metgasco Limited Casino Ipswich Gas Pipeline (EPBC ref. 2007/3877).

(2) What steps did the department take in order to satisfy itself that World Heritage was not required to be a controlling provision in this matter.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The delegate in this matter determined World Heritage values not to be a controlling provision for assessment of this proposal, because no likely significant impacts to those values were identified. A major consideration in reaching this conclusion was that the proposed pipeline route is within an existing road reserve, and the pipeline would be buried for its entire length with only the mainline valves being above ground.

The proponent has proposed mitigation measures, such as weed control and ensuring all actions are undertaken within the existing road reserve, to minimise potential significant impacts on World Heritage values. The future assessment of this proposal will further examine the likely significant impacts on listed threatened species known or likely to occur along the route of the pipeline, including the Eastern Bristlebird and Hastings River Mouse.

Australia Post  
(Question No. 1562)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, upon notice, on 24 February 2012:

With reference to an article in Ashcroft 2012 Reflections & Insight dated 1 January 2012, headed 'Australia Post is up to no good with Clause 22!', can Australia Post provide: (a) a detailed response to the matters raised in the article; and (b) an explanation for its conduct surrounding these matters.

Senator Conroy: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

As this matter is still the subject of confidential negotiations between Australia Post and the Licensee it would be inappropriate to make any public comment on the article in question. However, Australia Post has advised it has no plans to withdraw postal services from the Vaucluse community and has kept the Member for Wentworth, the Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP, abreast of the situation.

Employment and Workplace Relations  
(Question No. 1564)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations, upon notice, on 27 February 2012:
(1) Is the department aware of its obligations under section 11C of the Freedom of Information Act 1982 (the Act) in relation to the freedom of information disclosure log.

(2) Why do some documents mentioned in the disclosure log appear with the message, 'This document is not currently available for download. Please contact 1300 363 079 to request a copy'.

(3) Is the department in receipt of any advice suggesting that documents may not be published and can be substituted with a message.

(4) Why has the department failed to satisfy section 11C of the Act.

Senator Ludwig: The Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) The department is aware of its obligations under section 11C of the Freedom of Information Act 1982 (the FOI Act) in relation to the freedom of information disclosure log.

(2) Sub-section 11C(3) of the FOI Act provides that with respect to the obligation to publish information in accessed documents, "the agency, or the Minister, must publish the information to members of the public generally on a website by:

(a) making the information available for downloading from the website; or

(b) publishing on the website a link to another website, from which the information can be downloaded; or

(c) publishing on the website other details of how the information may be obtained."

The department complies with sub-section 11C(3) of the FOI Act by publishing documents in an accessible format or linking to another website (where possible) and where this is not possible, or impractical, by complying with paragraph 11C(3)(c) i.e. listing the information in the disclosure log and giving details of how the information may be obtained. Where a request is made for a document listed on the disclosure log, the document is then converted into an accessible format and published to the disclosure log.

(3) The department is not in receipt of any advice suggesting that documents may not be published and can be substituted with a message. The department relies on the plain meaning of paragraph 11C(3)(c) to underpin its approach to the disclosure log.

(4) The department has satisfied its obligations under section 11C of the FOI Act.

World Heritage Areas

(Question No. 1568)

Senator Waters asked the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, upon notice, on 27 February 2012:

(1) Can the Minister advise how the Australian Government is discharging its World Heritage obligations in relation to managing Fraser Island.

(2) Did the Commonwealth Government provide any funding for Stage 1 of the Fraser Island Dingo Population Study, and is it providing any funding for Stage 2 of the study.

(3) When is the Stage 2 report due, and what caused the delay given that the Stage 1 report states its expected publication was July 2011.

(4) Does the Minister or department have a role in agreeing to and/or approving the Fraser Island dingo management strategy, and when will the strategy next be reviewed.

(5) Given that the Fraser Island Dingo Population Study was intended to inform the Fraser Island dingo management strategy on an ongoing basis, can the Minister advise how the findings of current studies are being incorporated in a timely fashion into the Fraser Island dingo management strategy, and/or operational procedures in managing the island.
**Senator Conroy:** The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) The Australian Government discharges its World Heritage Obligations in relation to managing Fraser Island through the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) in which world heritage is afforded protection as a matter of national environmental significance. The 'matter protected' in relation to declared world heritage properties is the world heritage values of the property.

The Australian Government also works with the Queensland Government on the protection of the world heritage values of Fraser Island through the Fraser Island world heritage advisory committees. The day-to-day management of Fraser Island is undertaken by Queensland Parks and Wildlife.

(2) The Australian Government did not provide funding for the Fraser Island Dingo Population Study for either Stage 1 or 2.

(3) The Queensland Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) has advised that the Stage 2 preliminary report is due from the University of Queensland before the end of this financial year.

DERM has also advised that the timeframe for the final Stage 2 report was extended to allow the scientists additional time to finalise the statistical modelling.

(4) The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) supported the draft Dingo Management Strategy through its membership on the Fraser Island World Heritage Management Committee.

The strategy was reviewed in 2006. Further review of the strategy is not currently scheduled, and is a matter for the Queensland Government to determine.

(5) The findings of the study are used by the Queensland Government in its day-to-day management and will be incorporated into the Dingo Management Strategy. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities receives regular updates on the population study and the strategy via the Fraser Island world heritage advisory committees.

Future decisions relating to the strategy and operational management of Fraser Island are a matter for the Queensland Government.

**Coal Seam Gas**

(Question No. 1569)

**Senator Waters** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, upon notice, on 27 February 2012:

With reference to coal seam gas exploration in the Pilliga Forest, and given that it is the largest temperate woodland left in eastern Australia, arguably a perfect example of an 'ecosystem of national significance': In the upcoming reforms to the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999:

(a) will the Government open up the proposed new trigger of 'ecosystems of national significance' to public nominations, thereby enabling areas such as the Pilliga Forest to receive due recognition; and

(b) if not, will the Government undertake an assessment of the Pilliga Forest for potential classification as an 'ecosystem of national significance' if the reforms are implemented.

**Senator Conroy:** The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

significance will be identified through strategic approaches, and there will be no separate public nomination process.”

(b) As stated in the Australian Government’s response to Recommendation 8 of the Independent Review of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999: “Ecosystems of national significance will be identified, spatially defined and assessed through one of the following strategic approaches: regional environment plans, strategic assessments, or conservation agreements with the states and territories.”

As the reforms to the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 have yet to be considered by the Parliament, it would be premature to identify particular areas for consideration as ecosystems of national significance.

Health Services Union
(Question No. 1570)

Senator Abetz: asked the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations, upon notice, on 28 February 2012:

Does the Minister consider that Fair Work Australia’s investigation into the Health Services Union has taken an unreasonable amount of time.

Senator Ludwig: The Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

The General Manager of Fair Work Australia, an independent statutory office holder, is responsible for the conduct of the investigations into the Health Services Union.

I note however that at the recent Additional Estimates hearings the then Acting General Manager acknowledged “that on the face of it the inquiries and subsequent investigations have taken an unreasonably long time”. To that end, the Acting General Manager announced that KPMG will be undertaking an independent review into the conduct of the investigations and that the outcome of the KPMG review will be made public.

As the investigations are completely independent of the Government, the Government will consider the findings of the KPMG review before deciding whether to comment publicly on this matter.

World Heritage Areas
(Question No. 1571)

Senator Bob Brown asked the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, upon notice, on 29 February 2012:

With reference to the Minister’s response to a question without notice on 27 February 2012 (Senate Hansard, proof p. 22), what components of the protected wild rivers of south-west Queensland fail to warrant protection under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 as having ‘national environmental significance’.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

Queensland’s Wild Rivers Act 2005 aims to preserve the natural values of wild rivers by providing for declarations of rivers as ‘wild’ and then regulating future development activities within the declared wild river and its catchment area.

In wild river areas, projects such as in-stream dams and weirs, surface mining, and intensive agriculture are subject to restrictions. Low impact activities such as small-scale commercial fishing, ecotourism, and sustainable industries are permitted with Queensland Government approval.
The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) protects matters of national environmental significance:

- world heritage properties;
- national heritage places;
- wetlands of international importance (listed under the Ramsar Convention);
- listed threatened species and ecological communities;
- migratory species protected under international agreements;
- Commonwealth marine areas;
- the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and
- nuclear actions (including uranium mines).

The EPBC Act operates independently of Queensland's Wild Rivers legislation.

Under the EPBC Act, actions that have, or are likely to have, a significant impact on a matter of national environmental significance require approval from the Australian Government Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the minister).

Matters other than matters of national environmental significance are not protected under the EPBC Act except in relation to actions proposed on, or that will affect, Commonwealth land and actions proposed by Commonwealth agencies, where the matter protected is the environment.

**Defence: Staffing**

*(Question No. 1572)*

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

As at 31 December 2011, how many:

(a) permanent uniformed staff, both part-time and full time; and
(b) civilian staff, both part time and full time, were in each of the service areas (i.e. army, navy, and air force).

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(a) As at 31 December 2011, the following permanent part-time and full time uniformed staff were in each of the three Service areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent and Full Time Reserves</th>
<th>Active Reserves</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>14,165</td>
<td>4,717</td>
<td>18,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>29,979</td>
<td>16,126</td>
<td>46,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>14,387</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>18,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) As at 31 December 2011, the following part time and full time civilians were in each of the three service areas:

Navy, 846
Army, 1,206
Air Force, 912
Defence: Staffing  
(Question No. 1573)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how many uniformed full time, permanent personnel were recruited to each of the service areas (i.e. army, navy and air force).

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, the following uniformed full time, permanent personnel were recruited into each service;

- Navy, 440
- Army, 1075
- Air Force, 134

Defence: Staffing  
(Question No. 1575)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how many temporary civilian positions, both full time and part time, were created in the department, in the Defence Materiel Organisation and in the Defence Science and Technology Organisation.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, the following temporary civilian positions, both full time and part time, were created (averaged over the period):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>84 (inclusive of DMO and DSTO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Materiel Organisation</td>
<td>58(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Science and Technology Organisation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Over the same period DMO inactivated 58 temporary positions, so there is no change to the overall number of temporary positions in the DMO.

Defence: Staffing  
(Question No. 1576)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how many temporary civilian positions, including part time, existed in the department, in the Defence Materiel Organisation and in the Defence Science and Technology Organisation.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, the following temporary civilian positions, including part time, existed (averaged over the period):
Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how many civilian employees, including full time and part time, were employed on contract and at what levels of remuneration.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, the following civilian employees, including full time and part time, were employed on contract with the associated levels of remuneration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>SALARY RANGE</th>
<th>COUNT OF EMPLOYEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS - Trainee</td>
<td>22,423 - 31,155</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 1</td>
<td>39,671 - 44,532</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 2</td>
<td>44,896 - 50,471</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 2-3 Technical</td>
<td>44,896 - 55,880</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 3</td>
<td>51,139 - 55,880</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 3-4 Technical</td>
<td>51,139 - 63,243</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 4</td>
<td>57,929 - 63,243</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 4-5 Professional, Academic and Public Affairs</td>
<td>57,929 - 68,092</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 5</td>
<td>63,570 - 68,092</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 6</td>
<td>69,642 - 79,555</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEC LEVEL 1</td>
<td>88,019 - 99,285</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEC LEVEL 2</td>
<td>101,519 - 139,897</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES 1</td>
<td>136,142 - 162,863</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES 2</td>
<td>164,584 - 201,377</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES 3</td>
<td>202,356 - 257,008</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, what was the average cost in recruiting each new uniformed person into each of the service areas (i.e. army, navy and air force).

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:
The simple average cost per recruit for the period 1 July to 31 December 2011 was $23,514 per recruit across Navy, Army and Air Force.

This is a simple average based on the total expenditure by Defence Force Recruiting in the period 1 July to 31 December 2011 ($63,557 million) divided by the total number of uniformed personnel recruited to the Australian Defence Force through Defence Force Recruiting in this period (2,703).

While ceremonial activities and community based activities have an indirect benefit to recruitment, they are not classified as direct recruitment costs and as such are not included in these costs.

**Defence: Staffing**
*(Question No. 1579)*

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

What was the total expenditure on recruiting for the period 1 July to 31 December 2011.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The total direct expenditure by Defence Force Recruiting on recruitment into the Australian Defence Force in the period 1 July to 31 December 2011 was $63,557 million.

**Defence: Staffing**
*(Question No. 1580)*

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how much was paid to the Australian Defence Force prime recruiting agency for the provision of services.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The total amount paid to Manpower Services (Australia) Pty Ltd for the provision of Australian Defence Force recruiting services in the period 1 July to 31 December 2011 was $31,449 million.

**Defence: Staffing**
*(Question No. 1585)*

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications':

(1) As at 31 December 2011, how many uniformed personnel, full time and part time, were employed.

(2) As at 1 July and 31 December 2011, how many uniformed personnel were employed on the projects.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) As at 31 December 2011, there were 58,034 full-time and part-time permanent uniformed personnel employed. This number, like the workforce data detailed in the Strategic Reform Program Indicative Workforce Implications, reflects full-time equivalent average numbers, known as Average
Funded Strength (AFS) for military personnel. Using the AFS approach, Defence counts full-time and part-time service as one overall average quantity.

(2) The Government provisioned an additional 1,375 full-time equivalent uniformed personnel for 2011-12 under the White Paper, as reflected in the Strategic Reform Program: Making It Happen booklet and updated at Table 2.14 of the Defence Annual Report 2010-11.

This workforce has been allocated to the Services to implement a range of White Paper initiatives including the Defence Capability Plan. The personnel ranged from sailors, soldiers and airmen/women to senior officers on an as needed basis according to the particular White Paper projects and initiatives being actioned, including through the Strategic Reform Program.

Because of the breadth and depth of the White Paper initiatives, the number of personnel varied throughout the specified period and it is not possible to provide a specific total referenced to each White Paper project.

**Defence: Staffing**
(Question No. 1586)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications – Military Workforce':

(1) As at 31 December 2011, how many civilian personnel, full time and part time, were employed in implementing the White Paper initiatives.

(2) As at 1 July and 31 December 2011:

(a) how many civilian personnel were employed; and

(b) in what programs.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) and (2) (a)-(b) The Government provisioned an additional 1,556 civilian personnel (Defence inclusive of the Defence Materiel Organisation, including Australian Public Service staff and contractors) for 2011-12 under the White Paper, as reflected in the publication The Strategic Reform Program: Making It Happen and updated at Table 2.14 of the Defence Annual Report 2010-11. This provision applied on both 1 July and 31 December 2011.

The workforce data detailed in both publications are based on approved allocations at the time of publication and reflect full-time equivalent average numbers. Using the full-time equivalent (FTE) approach, Defence counts full-time and part-time service as one overall average quantity.

This workforce has been allocated across all Defence Groups to implement a range of White Paper initiatives including the Defence Capability Plan.

These Australian Public Service personnel ranged from junior to senior officers on an as needed basis according to the particular White Paper initiatives being actioned.

Because of the breadth and depth of the White Paper initiatives, the number of personnel varied throughout the specified period and it is not possible to provide a specific total referenced to each White Paper initiative.
Defence: Staffing
(Question No. 1587)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications – Military Workforce': For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how many uniformed personnel, including full time and part time, were employed in implementing the White Paper initiatives.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The Government provisioned an additional 1,375 full-time equivalent uniformed personnel for 2011-12 under the White Paper, as reflected in the Strategic Reform Program: Making It Happen booklet and updated at Table 2.14 of the Defence Annual Report 2010-11.

The workforce data detailed in both publications are based on approved allocations at the time of publication and reflect full-time equivalent average numbers, known as Average Funded Strength (AFS) for military personnel. Using the AFS approach, Defence counts full-time and part-time service as one overall average quantity.

This workforce has been allocated to the Services to implement a range of White Paper initiatives including the Defence Capability Plan. The personnel ranged from sailors, soldiers and airmen/women to senior officers on an as needed basis according to the particular White Paper projects and initiatives being actioned, including through the Strategic Reform Program.

Because of the breadth and depth of the White Paper initiatives, the number of personnel varied throughout the specified period and it is not possible to provide a specific total referenced to each White Paper project.

In relation to the overall military workforce, over the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, the Defence military workforce decreased from 58,861 full-time equivalent average uniformed personnel to 58,034, and the overall average over the period was 58,335.

Defence: Staffing
(Question No. 1588)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications – Military Workforce': For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, what reduction has there been in the number of personnel, including full time and part time, employed in implementing:

(a) efficiency improvements;
(b) civilianisation; and
(c) support productivity improvements.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications - Military Workforce', for the period 1 July to 31 December 2011:

(a) Implementation of the improvements component of the Strategic Reform Program, which includes shared services initiatives and business improvement within Groups and Services, has led to a
reduction of 24 military positions, known as Average Funded Strength (AFS), in the period 1 July to 31 December 2011;

(b) Civilianisation is part of the workforce reform element of workforce shared services reform and forms part of Defence's move to establish the best workforce mix of its non-combat-related workforce and to have the military workforce primarily undertake combat or combat related roles. A phased implementation has realised 50 AFS in the period 1 July to 31 December 2011.

(c) With regards to implementing the support productivity improvements component of the Strategic Reform Program, there was no reduction in the number of full-time equivalent personnel employed. The support productivity improvements component of the Strategic Reform Program is a continuous improvement plan scheduled to commence in financial year 2014-15, following on from the completed implementation of the other workforce and shared services components of the Strategic Reform Program.

**Defence: Staffing**  
*(Question No. 1589)*

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications – Military Workforce': As at 31 December 2011, what increase or reduction has there been in civilian personnel employed, full time and part time, in the department and in the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) since 1 July 2008.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The workforce data detailed in the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications' are based on approved allocations at the time of publication and reflect full-time equivalent average numbers for each financial year.

On 30 July 2008 Defence (including DMO) employed 20,439 full-time equivalent average APS personnel and approximately 704 contractors (noting that contractor reporting mechanisms were not mature in July 2008). As at 31 December 2011, Defence (including DMO) was employing 21,891 full-time equivalent average APS personnel and 416 contractors.

This represents an increase in APS personnel of +1,452 (+7.1 per cent), and a reduction in contractors of approximately -288 (-40.9 per cent) since 1 July 2008. Of these overall changes, the APS increase in Defence was +881 (+5.9 per cent) while in DMO it was +571 (+10.5 per cent). The number of contractors in Defence decreased by -138 (-27.7 per cent) while in DMO they decreased by -150 (-72.8 per cent).

**Defence: Staffing**  
*(Question No. 1590)*

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications – Civilian Workforce': For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how many personnel, including full time and part time, were employed as Australian Public Service staff or contractors.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:
The workforce data detailed in the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications' are based on approved allocations at the time of publication and reflect full-time equivalent average numbers. Using the full-time equivalent (FTE) approach, Defence counts full-time and part-time service as one overall average quantity.

Over the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, the Defence civilian workforce increased from 21,296 full-time equivalent average APS personnel and 408 contractors, to 21,891 full-time equivalent average APS personnel and 416 contractors.

**Defence: Staffing**
**(Question No. 1591)**

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program (SRP) 'Indicative Workforce Implications – Civilian Workforce': For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how many Australian Public Service staff or contractors, including full time and part time, were employed on White Paper/SRP initiatives.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The Government provisioned an additional 1,556 civilian personnel (in Defence and the Defence Materiel Organisation, including Australian Public Service staff and contractors) for 2011-12 under the White Paper, as reflected in the publication The Strategic Reform Program: Making It Happen and updated at Table 2.14 of the Defence Annual Report 2010-11.

When staff savings resulting from the Strategic Reform Program (SRP) are accounted for, the net White Paper/SRP total reflected in the Defence Annual Report 2010-11 reduces to 1,261.

The workforce data detailed in The Strategic Reform Program: Making It Happen and the Defence Annual Report 2010-11 are based on approved allocations at the time of publication and reflect full-time equivalent average numbers. Using the full-time equivalent (FTE) approach, Defence counts full-time and part-time service as one overall quantity.

**Defence: Staffing**
**(Question No. 1592)**

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications – Civilian Workforce': For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, what reduction has there been in the number of Australian Public Service staff or contractors employed in implementing:

(a) efficiency improvements;
(b) civilianisation;
(c) support productivity improvements; and
(d) contractor conversion (reduction to contractors).

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(a) with regards to implementing the efficiency improvements component of the Strategic Reform Program, there was a reduction of 115 in the number of full-time equivalent personnel employed;
(b) with regards to implementing the civilianisation component of the Strategic Reform Program, there was no reduction in the number of full-time equivalent personnel employed. The civilianisation program will see growth to the Australian Public Service (APS) to equalise the reductions to Military personnel.

(c) with regards to implementing the support productivity improvements component of the Strategic Reform Program, there was no reduction in the number of full-time equivalent personnel employed. The support productivity improvements component of the Strategic Reform Program is a continuous improvement plan scheduled to commence in financial year 2014-15, following on from the completed implementation of the other workforce and shared services components of the Strategic Reform Program; and

(d) with regards to implementing the contractor conversion component of the Strategic Reform Program, there was a reduction of 74 contractor positions in the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, and an increase of 171 APS full time equivalent. The increase in APS is associated with a lag in filling positions previously vacated by contractors in the previous year.

**Defence: Staffing**
(Question No. 1593)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program 'Indicative Workforce Implications – Civilian Workforce': As at 31 December 2011, what increase or reduction has there been in full-time and part-time Australian Public Service staff or contractors employed since 1 July 2008.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information sought is contained in the response to Senate Question on Notice 1589.

**Defence: Submarines**
(Question No. 1596)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011:

(a) how many fully qualified personnel are 'Dolphin Qualified' and permanently employed in the Royal Australian Navy to operate submarines; and

(b) how many 'Dolphin Qualified' personnel were tasked with other duties and what were these duties.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(a) As at 31 December 2011, there were a total of 569 submarine-qualified personnel, 501 of which were Collins submarine qualified. The remainder included Oberon-qualified personnel and others who, though qualified, had taken up different career paths in Navy; however, still have the capacity to serve in some submarine support roles.

(b) There were 48 Collins submarine qualified personnel employed in other duties, including administration, operations, maintenance, logistics and personnel management roles. A number of these personnel have withdrawn their volunteer status for service in Collins submarines. Others have reached ranks for which there are no positions in the Submarine Force (for example, Petty Officer Cooks and Stewards).
Defence: Submarines  
(Question No. 1597)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how many personnel fully completed training courses and became 'Dolphin Qualified' and eligible to serve on submarines.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

Thirty three personnel completed training and became submarine-qualified during the period 1 July to 31 December 2011.

Defence: Submarines  
(Question No. 1598)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, how many personnel completed training courses and became 'Perisher Qualified' and eligible to command a submarine.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

As the Submarine Command Course ('Perisher') is run annually in the Netherlands during the first half of each year, no personnel became 'Perisher-Qualified' over the period 1 July to 31 December 2011. There are two Australian submariners on the current course.

Defence: Submarines  
(Question No. 1599)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

As at 31 December 2011, how many Royal Australian Navy personnel were 'Perisher Qualified' and eligible to command a submarine.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

As at 31 December 2011, 16 Royal Australian Navy officers of the ranks Lieutenant Commander and Commander were 'Perisher-Qualified' and eligible to command a submarine.

Defence: Submarines  
(Question No. 1600)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, which submarines were undergoing maintenance / refit programs and for what length of time.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

Over the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, submarines undergoing maintenance / refit programs were as follows:
(i) HMAS Collins was completing a planned certification extension docking, which concluded on 18 August 2011. The submarine continued unscheduled maintenance until 21 October 2011.

(ii) HMAS Farncomb commenced a planned intermediate maintenance availability on 16 November 2011, which was ongoing for the remainder of the period.

(iii) HMAS Waller commenced a planned mid-cycle docking on 13 September 2011, which was ongoing for the remainder of the period. From 4 July to 13 September 2011, Waller was conducting mid cycle docking preparations.

(iv) HMAS Dechaineux conducted unscheduled maintenance from 5 to 9 August 2011.

(v) HMAS Sheean was conducting a planned full cycle docking throughout.

(vi) HMAS Rankin was conducting a planned full cycle docking throughout.

Defence: Network Centric Warfare
(Question No. 1602)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

(1) Given that video communications are integrated into robots, soldiers and unmanned aerial vehicles, network centric warfare is becoming the organising principle of war fighting, and frontline demands for bandwidth are rising at a rapid rate, for the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, what did the Australian Defence Force do and how much did it spend on:

(a) establishing a network centric warfare capability; and
(b) addressing the issue of increased bandwidth?

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

Network Centric Warfare Capability Policy and Plans

(1) A similar question has previously been asked under Senate Question on Notice No.760 for the period 1 January to 30 June 2011 and a response was provided. The response to this question provides updated information for the requested period of 1 July to 31 December 2011 and should also be read in conjunction with the response to Senate Question on Notice No.484, which covered the period 1 July to 31 December 2010. Defence was engaged in the following network centric warfare activities from 1 July to 31 December 2011.

• The Network Centric Roadmap is in the process of being updated to reflect the change from a vulnerable ‘centric’ approach to that of a distributed Network Enabled approach. This facilitates redundancy and reversionary modes in time of loss or disconnection due to enemy action or natural causes, and has been the focus of much activity in the maritime domain.

• Navy Information Warfare Master Plan. Navy is finalising development of the Plan ($245, 000).

Network Centric Capability and Increased Bandwidth

On the matter of increasing bandwidth, Defence was engaged in the following activities from 1 July to 30 December 2011.

• Joint Project 2089 (Tactical Information Exchange Domain)
  - Phase 2 - Risk reduction program for the implementation of Variable Message Format (VMF) into the F/A-18A/B ‘Classic’ Hornet has been completed. Around $6.5 million has been spent on this program.
  - Phase 2B - Implementation of VMF into the F/A-18A/B ‘Classic’ Hornet continues. Around $12 million has been spent on this program in the period.
- Phase 2A - Implementation of advanced Tactical Data Links (comprising of Link 16 and VMF) into the ANZAC Class frigate and shore facilities. Around $41 million has been spent on this program in the period.
- Phase 2A - Implementation of an Initial Common Support Infrastructure as a Proof of Capability to manage the NCW networks. Around $15 million has been spent on this program.

- **Tactical Information Exchange Domain (TIED)**
  - The DMO Tactical Information Exchange Integration Office (TIEIO), operating the Australian Defence Force Tactical Data Link Authority (ADFTA), has been providing technical and engineering integration support to the ADF TIED and NCW objectives (approximately $5.0 million in the period).

- **Joint Project 2008 (ADF Satellite Communications)** has delivered the following:
  - Phase 3F - Defence continues the development of a long term satellite ground station capability on the Australian West coast ($7.2 million);
  - Phase 3H - Delivered trial equipment to enable a trial of an advanced modulation technology that may allow more efficient and flexible use of Australia's WGS capacity ($4.2 million);
  - Phase 4 - continued milestone payments for the sixth Wideband Global SATCOM satellite ($41.073 million); and
  - Phase 5A - Defence continued the acquisition of an Ultra High Frequency payload on the IS-22 commercial satellite over the Indian Ocean Region, which was launched in March, and will become operational later this year ($11.001 million).

- **Joint Project 2043 (High Frequency Modernisation)** has delivered the following:
  - completed the rollout of 400 watt High Frequency (HF) Automatic Link Establishment (ALE) radio systems in a transit case solution to army units ($9.2 million), and
  - upgrades to thirteen Black Hawk helicopters with HF ALE capable radios ($7.03 million)

- **Joint Project 2072 (Battlespace Communications Systems – Land) Phase One**
  - Joint Project 2072 (Battlespace Communications Systems – Land) Phase One, continues to deliver the new generation of Combat Net Radio and Tactical Data Radios from Harris and Raytheon. The Initial Materiel Release milestone was achieved in June 2011 with the majority of equipment and vehicle installations to occur throughout 2012 ($58 million). JP2072 Phase 2B is currently tendering a communications capability for deployed headquarters that includes network management, as a means of more effectively managing increased bandwidth requirements.

- **Communications Architecture**
  - Army is developing the architecture for the Land Reference Network in order to inform future network architecture and systems integration in support of Army.
  - The Land Network Integration Centre participated in a Multinational Experiment (MNE5) at White Sands, United States of America in October 2011 to test and validate Australian system interoperability with ABCA partners ($300,000).
  - **Optimisation**
    - In addition to increasing bandwidth, Defence is pursuing means to better use the available bandwidth through Network Optimisation protocols, improved integration and aggregation of services and the use of Cross Domain Solutions.
Defence
(Question Nos 1603 to 1605)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

(1) For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, for each agency within the responsibility of the Minister, how much was spent on media monitoring.

(2) As at 1 July and 31 December 2011:
   (a) how many staff, uniformed and civilian, full time and part time, were employed in public relations and/or the media in the department or each agency within the responsibility of the Minister;
   (b) what were the position levels of these staff; and
   (c) how many of these staff were: (i) permanent, (ii) temporary, or (iii) contractors.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) Department of Defence $331,703 (GST inclusive), Defence Housing Australia $22,641.31 (GST inclusive).

(2) (a) The majority of staff engaged in public affairs roles within the Department of Defence are located in the Communication and Media Branch and Strategic Communication Branch.

   As at 1 July 2011 the Communication and Media Branch employed 60 civilians, nine military personnel (including one deployed member) and four contractors.

   As at 31 December 2011 the Communication and Media Branch employed 58 civilians, nine military personnel and four contractors.

   As at 1 July 2011 Strategic Communication Branch employed 42 permanent military, 21 part-time military and five permanent civilian staff.

   As at 31 December 2011 the Strategic Communication Branch employed 41 permanent military, 15 part-time military and five permanent civilian staff.

   In addition, as at 1 July 2011, outside of the Communication and Media and Strategic Communication Branches there were a further 36 civilians, 14 military staff and one contractor who provided public affairs support as part of their regular duties within the Defence Groups and Services.

   As at 31 December 2011 there were 44 civilians and 14 military personnel.

   (2) (b) and (c) Communication and Media Branch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Staffing as at 1 July 2011</th>
<th>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1 x permanent SES Band1</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Staffing as at 1 July 2011</th>
<th>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defence Newspapers</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>5 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x temporary EL1</td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>1 x temporary APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x temporary APS6</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4-5</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4</td>
<td>4 x permanent CPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent/part-time APS4</td>
<td>1 x permanent SGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LS</td>
<td>1 x permanent LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent SGT</td>
<td>1 x permanent LAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CPL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LCPL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent AB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Operations</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>3 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>4 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x temporary APS6</td>
<td>3 x permanent APS4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 x permanent APS 4-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media, Entertainment</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>4 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Liaison and Branding</td>
<td>3 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>3 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time APS6</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time APS4</td>
<td>1 x temporary APS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent WO2</td>
<td>4 x contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 x contractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services, Operations &amp; Training</td>
<td>3 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent COL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Public Affairs, Communication Advisers and Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>10 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent APS2</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Communications</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time APS6</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary transfer to another work area or deployed</td>
<td>1 x permanent COL</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(2) (b) and (c) Strategic Communication Branch
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Staffing as at 1 July 2011</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directorate Plans &amp; Policy</td>
<td>2 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Directorate Plans &amp; Policy</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate Operations</td>
<td>1 x permanent COL</td>
<td>Directorate Operations</td>
<td>1 x permanent COL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Public Affairs</td>
<td>2 x part-time Reserve MAJ</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x Reserve MAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 x part-time Reserve CAPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 x Reserve LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 x part-time Reserve LT</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 x Reserve LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness, Plans and Training</td>
<td>4 x part time Reserve MAJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x Reserve LET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x Reserve SQNLDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Joint Public Affairs Unit</td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>1st Joint Public Affairs Unit</td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent Reserve CFTS LEUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent FLTLT</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFTS LEUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 x permanent LT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent WO2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent FLTLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent PO</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 x permanent LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 x permanent SGT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent WO2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 x permanent CPL</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 x permanent Army SGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent AB</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent RAAF SGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 x permanent Army CPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent RAAF CPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Headquarters Support</td>
<td>2 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>Military Headquarters Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent Reserve CFTS LEUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFTS LEUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 x permanent CAPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent LT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended leave/Maternity leave/Temp transfer to another Group</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Extended leave/Maternity leave/Temp transfer to another Group</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative / Logistic Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent WGCDR</td>
<td>Administrative / Logistic Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent WGCDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x part-time Reserve SGT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x part-time Reserve SGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) (b) and (c) Personnel outside of the Communication and Media Branch and the Strategic Communication Branch who provided public affairs support as a part of their regular duties within Groups and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Group</th>
<th>Staffing as at 1 July 2011</th>
<th>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chief of the Defence Force</td>
<td>6 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>4 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>2 x permanent APS 6</td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CMDR</td>
<td>1 x permanent CMDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x permanent LEUT</td>
<td>1 x permanent Reserve CFTS CMDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent PO</td>
<td>2 x permanent LEUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>3 x permanent APS 6</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x temporary EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS 4-5</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS 6</td>
<td>3 x permanent APS 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x permanent FLTLT</td>
<td>2 x permanent FLTLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time FLTLT</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time FLTLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Strategies and Policy</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence and Security</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS5</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4</td>
<td>1 x permanent APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Science and Technology</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>2 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>4 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Materiel Organisation</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2 (50% of role)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS 6</td>
<td>2 x permanent APS 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Finance Office</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Office</td>
<td>2 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQJOC</td>
<td>1 x permanent LTCOL</td>
<td>1 x permanent LTCOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent SQNLDR</td>
<td>1 x permanent SQNLDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/ Service</td>
<td>Communications Program - 1 July to 31 December 2011</td>
<td>Total Spend ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Strategies and Policy Group</td>
<td>Navy brand and job specific advertising for Navy Officer and general entry priority roles</td>
<td>$3,785,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Army brand and job specific advertising for Army Officer and general entry priority roles</td>
<td>$4,128,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Force brand and job specific advertising for Air Force Officer and general entry priority roles</td>
<td>$1,625,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising Australian Defence Force Gap Year, Australian Defence Force Academy Sponsored Undergraduate positions and Professional Graduate Health and Engineering positions</td>
<td>$574,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of the AFL Army Award at the national and local levels</td>
<td>$165,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Science and Technology Organisation</td>
<td>Pacific 2012 conference (planned in 2011; implemented in February 2012)</td>
<td>$62,386.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eureka Prize (support for defence science prize – September 2011)</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer Group</td>
<td>Young ICT Professionals Conference (YIT Con)</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Support Group</td>
<td>Military Communications and Information Systems (MilCIS) Conference</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HMAS Albatross Redevelopment Stage 3 (Advertisement for the Community Consultation Forum)</td>
<td>$417.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAND 17 Phase 1A Infrastructure Project to support the introduction of Artillery Replacement (Advertisement for the Community Consultation Forum)</td>
<td>$3,012.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAAF Base East Sale Redevelopment (Advertisement for the Community Consultation Forum)</td>
<td>$253.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point Cook Remediation Project (PWC Consultation activities – posted 1/7/11)</td>
<td>$4,432.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group/ Service Communications Program - 1 July to 31 December 2011 Total Spend ($)  
Columboola Community Consultation (WWII Columboola Chemical Munitions Destruction project communication program advertising – posted 13/12/11) $390.40  
Employee Assistance Program (EAP) Roadmap Postcard August 2011. Note the Postcard costs were covered under the EAP budget. $940.00  
Employee Assistance Program (EAP) Roadmap booklet in August 2011. Note the Postcard costs were covered under the EAP budget. $9,128.18  
Employee Assistance Program (EAP) Roadmap Distribution (collating, postage costs). Note the Distribution costs were covered by Defence Publishing. $19,022.72  

Defence: Freedom of Information  
(Question Nos 1615 to 1617)  
Senator Johnston asked Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:  
For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011, in regard to the department and each agency within the responsibility of the Minister/Parliamentary Secretary:  
(1) How many Freedom of Information (FOI) requests were received.  
(2) How many FOI requests were granted or denied.  
(3) How many conclusive certificates were issued in relation to FOI requests.  
Senator Chris Evans: the Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:  
(1) During the period 1 July 2011 to 31 December 2011, Defence received 157 FOI Requests.  
(2) During the period 1 July 2011 to 31 December 2011, 173 FOI requests were finalised by Defence under section 15 and three under section 48 of the FOI Act. The following table provides a breakdown of these requests:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 15 requests Completed</th>
<th>Granted in full</th>
<th>Partial disclosure</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
<th>Transferred</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 48 requests Completed</th>
<th>Granted in full – alter record</th>
<th>Granted in part – alter record</th>
<th>Granted– annotate record</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Conclusive certificates no longer exist. They were abolished under the Freedom of Information (Removal of Conclusive Certificates and Other Measures) Act 2009.
Notes

1. Where a document is identified and exempted in full, access to the document can be denied, with reference to the relevant exemption provisions of the FOI Act. During the period in question, one denial related to documents to which section 47E certain operations of an agency provisions applied, two denials related to documents to which section 47C deliberative processes provisions applied.

2. Section 24A of the FOI Act provides for requests for access to documents to be refused if the documents cannot be found or do not exist. Access may also be refused if the work involved in processing the request would substantially and unreasonably divert resources of an agency. For the period in question, all nine refusals related to documents that did not exist or could not be found.

3. In accordance with section 21 of the FOI Act, where a decision has been made to grant access, a decision maker may defer access to a document for a period of time. There were two such deferrals during this period.

---

**Defence: Reviews**

*Question Nos 1618 to 1620*

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For each portfolio/agency within the responsibility of the Minister/Parliamentary Secretary:

1. How many reviews are currently being undertaken in the portfolio/agency or affecting the portfolio/agency.

2. What was the commencement date of each review.

3. When will each review conclude.

4. (a) Which reviews were completed in the period 1 July to 31 December 2011; and (b) when will the Government respond to the each of these reviews.

5. As at 31 December 2011, what was the cost of each of these reviews.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

Response to Senate Question on Notice No.1500 details reviews that were being conducted or had recently concluded as at 31 January 2012.

---

**Defence: Submarines**

*Question No. 1622*

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

As at 31 December 2011:

1. Is it still planned to acquire 12 submarines as per the White Paper direction 'the Government takes the view that our future strategic circumstances necessitate a substantially expanded submarine fleet of 12 boats in order to sustain a force at sea' (Defence White Paper 2009, p. 64, paragraph 8.40).

2. What plans and strategies are in place to man the 12 future submarines given the great difficulty, in 2010 11, of manning and operating the current fleet of submarines.

3. What is the expected cost of acquiring 12 future submarines, over the next:

   (a) 12 months;

   (b) 5 years;

   (c) 10 years; and
(d) 15 years.

(4) What funding has been provided to assist in the planning for the 12 future submarines.

(5) When is it expected that the first pass approval will be provided to advance the purchase of the 12 future submarines.

(6) What are the expected through life support and operating costs of a fleet of 12 future submarines over a 30 year operating period.

(7) When is it envisaged that the first of the 12 future submarines will be launched and fully operational.

(8) What is the expected cost per year of maintaining and operating the existing 6 Collins Class submarines until they are decommissioned, broken down by year until 2025.

(9) What is the specific phasing out program for the existing Collins Class submarines.

(10) What are the projected costs and project time-lines of the Submarine Lifetime Extension Program.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1). Yes.

(2) Crewing requirements for the future submarines are yet to be determined and will depend on a range of factors that will be examined by the SEA1000 program. Appropriate crewing strategies will be developed as part of this process.

(3) Options are currently being developed and are yet to be considered by government.

(4) Funding allocated to date is $19.377 million.

(5) On current schedule, first pass approval is planned for late 2013-early 2014.

(6) and (7) As a decision is yet to be taken on the platform to be acquired, this has not yet been determined.

(8) The Department of Defence estimates Defence Management Finance Plan (DMFP) costs over a 10-year period. A Collins Class submarine program budget for 2021-22 has not as yet been allocated.

Table 1 details current allocations for sustainment costs for the Collins class submarine, which are primarily incurred for contracted services to support the platform. These costs also include provision of Escape and Rescue Services, the Submarine Escape and Rescue Training Facility and support to the combat system. Additional funds are being sought through the Defence committees for financial year 2012-13 and beyond.

Table 1 - Current Funded DMFP financial years 2011-12 to 2020-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$'m</td>
<td>479.7</td>
<td>402.9</td>
<td>352.7</td>
<td>343.3</td>
<td>338.6</td>
<td>380.9</td>
<td>391.1</td>
<td>405.5</td>
<td>416.7</td>
<td>427.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected operating budget for the six Collins Class submarines in each of the financial years 2011-12 to 2021-22 is outlined in the table below:

Table 2 - Submarine Capability Direct Operating Cost Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$'m</td>
<td>174.93</td>
<td>176.79</td>
<td>182.32</td>
<td>190.60</td>
<td>205.88</td>
<td>207.68</td>
<td>216.89</td>
<td>226.66</td>
<td>224.26</td>
<td>234.43</td>
<td>208.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Collins operating cost estimates methodology has been revised subsequent to the answer in previous QoN responses, such as QON 504 (8). This revised cost estimates methodology includes Defence (inclusive of DMO) operating costs that directly contribute to submarine capability. Direct operating costs include the cost of suppliers, military workforce, civilian workforce, fuel, explosive...
ordnance, maritime ranges and communications sustainment. Table 2 does not include Collins sustainment cost, project costs or depreciation. Depreciation is estimated at around $160 million per annum.

(9) The Collins Class notional disposal/phase out dates are from 2025.

(10) The Service Life Evaluation Program is focussed on conducting an evaluation of the Collins Class to determine if the class can reach its planned withdrawal dates and potentially one operating cycle beyond. No estimates have yet been made in respect to schedule or cost for a life extension.

**Defence: Strategic Reform Program**

(Question No. 1624)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the Strategic Reform Program (SRP):

(1) For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011:

(a) where specifically have the provisional savings of the forecasted total been made under the SRP;
(b) can a detailed explanation be provided of where these savings have been realised; and
(c) what one off savings been made.

(2) For the period 1 July 2008 to 31 December 2011, what workforce savings, both in personnel reductions and dollar savings, per area as specified in the Budget Audit Review, have resulted where the gaps to average performance have been:

(a) improved and realized; and
(b) reduced to zero.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) (a) Cost reductions under the Strategic Reform Program (SRP) are based on a reduction of annual budgets. The rate and timing of the achievement of cost reductions over the reporting cycle varies from stream to stream depending on the initiatives they are measuring. Providing information on their achievement on a 6 month basis does not give a meaningful picture of stream performance. SRP governance closely monitors stream activities to ensure that planned activities remain on schedule.

Cost reductions under the SRP are based on annual budgets. In 2011-12 the cost reduction target under the SRP was $1,283.9 million. The work streams delivering these cost reductions are detailed in Table 1.

**Table 1: SRP cost reduction targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRP Stream</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
<td>147.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Sustainment &amp; Inventory</td>
<td>370.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Equipment Procurement</td>
<td>206.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce &amp; Shared Services</td>
<td>237.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>285.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost Reduction Target</strong></td>
<td>1,283.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Summation variances are due to rounding*
(1) (b) and (1) (c) SRP savings are tracked, reported and managed on a stream-by-stream basis. They are not broken up by sub-categories of productivity, one-offs or other descriptors. The annual budgets for activities targeted through streams have been reduced by amounts that reflect cost reductions agreed by Government.

The Department will publish the stream cost reductions achieved under SRP in the Defence Annual Report which is expected to be released in late 2012.

(2) (a) and (b) Outcomes of the Budget Audit Review are being achieved across three specific areas covering Workforce Reform, Business Process Improvements and Shared Services.

Through Workforce Reform 360 military, known as Average Funded Strength (AFS), and 604 contractor positions have been reduced and replaced with Australian Public Service (APS) employees. Combined with Efficiency and Effectiveness reductions of 292 APS the reforms have delivered $198.6 million in savings.

Twenty four AFS and 266 APS reductions generating $43 million in savings have been achieved through Business Process Improvements primarily as a result of Consolidation of regions, reduction in administration support to Senior Officers, amalgamation of Australian Defence Force Intelligence System and pooling of paralegals and rationalisation of help lines.

Improvements to Shared Services have seen reductions of 114 AFS and 132 APS generating $47.6 million in savings. This has been achieved largely through reforms in Education & Training, Career Management and Payroll and Personnel Administration.

Reforms are being implemented across the department in a wide range of areas. Many of these areas are integrating and implementing multiple reforms. The effort and attendant cost of monitoring and reporting changes in performance, and attributing the changes to specific reform initiatives is prohibitive.

Consequently there are no performance metrics (beyond efficiency metrics) defined that are able to indicate the performance impact attributable to specific SRP reforms.

Defence: Inventory Holdings

(Question No. 1629)

Senator Johnston asked Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011:

(a) of the savings expected over the period 2010 to 2019, what specific savings have been made in the optimising of inventory holdings and the introduction of more efficient management techniques; and

(b) what one off savings been made.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(a)-(b) Strategic Reform Program (SRP) savings are tracked, reported and managed on a stream-by-stream basis, they are not broken up by sub-category of optimising inventory holdings, introducing more efficient management techniques, one-offs or other descriptors.

The Smart Sustainment stream, which includes inventory, is comprised of a range of specific initiatives across the spectrum of Defence and the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO). These initiatives are at various stages of maturity and SRP governance closely monitors the progress of these initiatives against the planned schedule and achievement of agreed cost reductions.

The Department will publish the stream cost reductions achieved under SRP in the Defence Annual Report which is expected to be released in late 2012.
## Defence: Projects
*(Question No. 1632)*

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

For the period 1 July to 31 December 2011:

(a) what 'First Pass' Project approvals; and

(b) what 'Second Pass' Project approvals, have been made.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The tables below address both questions and provide information on the total 30 project based approvals achieved during the period 1 July to 31 December 2011. The total is made up of five first pass approvals, 16 second pass approvals, and nine 'other' approvals (such as studies, project re-scoping and real cost increases).

### Government Approvals 1 July 2011 – 31 December 2011 - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approval Type</th>
<th>Projects Approved</th>
<th>Total ($m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Jul 11 – 31 Dec 11</td>
<td>First Pass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jul 11 – 31 Dec 11</td>
<td>Second Pass</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jul 11 – 31 Dec 11</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Summary includes 'other' project approvals such as studies, project re-scoping, real cost increases, capability technology demonstrator and project development funding

### First Pass Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Env</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ph</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Total ($m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>5431</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>Fixed Base Air Traffic Management and Control System</td>
<td>21-Nov-11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>5438</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Lead In Fighter Capability Assurance Program</td>
<td>21-Nov-11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Joint Combined Training Capability – Mobile Electronic Warfare Threat Emitter System</td>
<td>15-Dec-11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>3024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woomera Range Remediation</td>
<td>05-Dec-11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures are rounded. Totals may not match due to rounding errors.

### Second Pass Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Env</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ph</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Total ($m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>5D</td>
<td>Additional Chinooks</td>
<td>23-Nov-11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Counter IED – Ningaui – HMEE</td>
<td>06-Dec-11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Counter IED – Ningaui – Full System</td>
<td>05-Dec-11</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Joint Command Support Environment</td>
<td>20-Sep-11</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amphibious Watercraft Replacement</td>
<td>20-Sep-11</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>Total (Sm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP 2069</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Grade Cryptographic Equipment</td>
<td>12-Oct-11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP 2072</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Battlespace Communications Systems (Land)</td>
<td>21-Nov-11</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP 3027</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>JDAM Enhancements</td>
<td>10-Oct-11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP 5408</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADF Navigation Warfare (NAVWAR) Capability – Handhelds (Pass 1 of 2)</td>
<td>22-Nov-11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND 17</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Artillery Replacement – Digital Fire Control Systems</td>
<td>05-Dec-11</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND 121</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlander - Field Vehicles and Trailers</td>
<td>29-Aug-11</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA 1352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evolved Sea Sparrow Missiles (ESSM) Upgrade &amp; Inventory Replenishment (Risk Reduction Study)</td>
<td>29-Aug-11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA 4000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>SM2 Conversion and Upgrade</td>
<td>29-Aug-11</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classified Project</td>
<td>29-Aug-11</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classified Project</td>
<td>29-Aug-11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classified Project</td>
<td>15-Dec-11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures are rounded. Totals may not match due to rounding errors.

**Other Approvals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Env</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ph</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Total (Sm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR 5438</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead In Fighter Capability Assurance Program (Spares buy)</td>
<td>05-Jul-11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR 7000</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maritime Patrol Aircraft Replacement (Intermediate Pass)</td>
<td>05-Dec-11</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP 2070</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Light Weight Anti-Submarine Torpedo Replacement (Release of preserved funds)</td>
<td>05-Dec-11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND 112</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASLAV Enhancement Project (Cancellation)</td>
<td>05-Dec-11</td>
<td>-277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND 121</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Vehicles &amp; Trailers – Down select decision</td>
<td>05-Dec-11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND 121</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Vehicles &amp; Trailers – PMV-L MSA (Intermediate Pass)</td>
<td>05-Dec-11</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND 121</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Vehicles &amp; Trailers – Bring forward decision</td>
<td>05-Dec-11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND 125</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soldier Enhancement Version 2 – Lethality</td>
<td>26-Sep-11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Env No</th>
<th>Ph</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Total ($m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEA 1448</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>ANZAC Anti-Ship Missile Defence Update – Ships 2-8</td>
<td>21-Nov-11</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures are rounded. Totals may not match due to rounding errors. Land 112 Ph 4 - ASLAV – Cancellation of the previously approved second pass project.

**Defence: Staffing**

(Question No. 1633)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

1. (a) How many training days have been allocated to Reserves in each state and territory; and (b) what is the budget allocation to provide these training days.
2. (a) How many training days were actually used by Reserves in each state and territory; and (b) what was the actual expenditure to provide these training days.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) (a) and (b) —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State / Territory</th>
<th>Reserve Days Allocated</th>
<th>Budget Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>46,357</td>
<td>$17,314,624.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>66,659</td>
<td>$35,141,776.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>$3,661,711.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>41,249</td>
<td>$25,062,015.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>16,633</td>
<td>$8,943,423.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>5,605</td>
<td>$3,658,126.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>24,230</td>
<td>$16,872,929.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td>$11,354,309.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>$80,950.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226,472</td>
<td>$122,089,867.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) (a) and (b) —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State / Territory</th>
<th>Reserve Days Used</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>34,663</td>
<td>$14,000,659.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>51,004</td>
<td>$31,043,513.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>4,374</td>
<td>$3,372,748.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>33,827</td>
<td>$23,245,183.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>13,554</td>
<td>$8,029,232.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>4,901</td>
<td>$3,500,802.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>20,050</td>
<td>$15,806,886.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>14,696</td>
<td>$10,116,202.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>$68,926.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177,322</td>
<td>$109,184,155.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Defence: Projects**

(Question No. 1664)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:
With reference to the major project Airborne Surveillance for Land Operations JP 129, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1665)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Establishment of Special Operations Command JP 199, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1666)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Next Generation Satellite Communications System JP 2008 Phase 4, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1667)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:
With reference to the major project Ultra High Frequency Satellite Communications JP 2008 Phase 5A, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

**Defence: Projects**

*(Question No. 1668)*

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project ADF SATCOM Capability Terrestrial Upgrade JP 2008 Phase 3F, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1669)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Jindalee Operational Radar Network (JORN) JP 2025, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1670)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Joint Command Support Environment (JCSE) JP 2030 Phase 8, can the following details be provided:
(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1671)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project High Frequency Modernisation JP 2043, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.
Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1672)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Amphibious Watercraft Replacement JP 2048 Phase 3, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1673)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Amphibious Deployment and Sustainment JP 2048 Phase 4 A/B, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;

(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;

(d) the date of first pass approval;

(e) the date of second pass approval;

(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;

(g) the amount spent to date on this project;

(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;

(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;

(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and

(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1674)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Bulk Liquid Distribution JP 2059, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;

(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;

(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;

(d) the date of first pass approval;

(e) the date of second pass approval;

(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;

(g) the amount spent to date on this project;

(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;

(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;

(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and

(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:
The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

**Defence: Projects**  
(Question No. 1675)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Geospatial Information Infrastructure and Services (GII&S) JP 2064 Phase 2, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

**Defence: Projects**  
(Question No. 1676)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Lightweight Torpedo Replacement Phase 3 JP 2070, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1677)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Lightweight Torpedo Replacement Phase 2 JP 2070, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:
The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1678)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Battlespace Communications Systems (LAND) JP 2072, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;
(d) the date of first pass approval;
(e) the date of second pass approval;
(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;
(g) the amount spent to date on this project;
(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;
(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;
(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and
(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1679)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Logistics for the Warfighter JP 2077, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;
(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
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(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;

(d) the date of first pass approval;

(e) the date of second pass approval;

(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;

(g) the amount spent to date on this project;

(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;

(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;

(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and

(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1680)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project ADF Deployable Logistics Systems JP 2077 Phase 2B.2, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;

(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;

(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;

(d) the date of first pass approval;

(e) the date of second pass approval;

(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;

(g) the amount spent to date on this project;

(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;

(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;

(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and

(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:
The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

**Defence: Projects**

(Question No. 1681)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Mulwala Redevelopment Project JP 2086, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;

(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;

(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;

(d) the date of first pass approval;

(e) the date of second pass approval;

(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;

(g) the amount spent to date on this project;

(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;

(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;

(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and

(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

**Defence: Projects**

(Question No. 1682)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Air Defence Target System JP 66 Phase 1, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;

(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;
(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;

(d) the date of first pass approval;

(e) the date of second pass approval;

(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;

(g) the amount spent to date on this project;

(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;

(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;

(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and

(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence: Projects
(Question No. 1683)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence Materiel, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to the major project Establishment of Tactical Assault Group (East) JP 2088 Phase 1, can the following details be provided:

(a) the date that the project was first proposed to Government as a major capital equipment initiative;

(b) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for first pass approval, as per the Defence Capability Plan (DCP), or when it was first proposed to Government;

(c) the date of the first estimated date, time period, for second pass approval, as per the DCP, or when it was first proposed to Government;

(d) the date of first pass approval;

(e) the date of second pass approval;

(f) the estimated acquisition cost when first proposed to Government;

(g) the amount spent to date on this project;

(h) the current estimated acquisition cost;

(i) the date of estimated initial operational capability when first proposed to Government;

(j) the current date of estimated initial operational capability; and

(k) the reason(s) for the delay in this project, if applicable.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence Materiel has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:
The information you are seeking would require considerable research into historical Defence Capability Plans and project approval/management documents, and as such, is considered an unjustified diversion of resources from the Capability Development Group's core business.

Publicly available documents such as the Public Defence Capability Plan, Portfolio Budget Statements and the Defence Annual Report provide some detail on the information being sought.

Defence

(Question No. 1684)

Senator Humphries asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to defective parade boots within the Australian Defence Force:

1. What was the nature of the defect.
2. When were the defective parade boots first issued.
3. How many pairs of the defective boots were: (a) issued; and (b) subsequently recovered.
4. How many Reports on Defective or Unsatisfactory Materiel (RODUMs) were submitted in regard to the potential defect.
5. How long did it take, from the time that the first report was lodged, until a replacement directive was issued.
6. What action was taken to ensure all defective boots were removed from service.
7. What was the cost incurred by the Commonwealth to replace the boots.
8. Was any of this cost transferred to the boot manufacturer.
9. Is the manufacturer still contracted by the department.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

1. The issue that led to the recall and modification of the patent leather parade boot involved a delamination of the sole. This occurs when the bonding compound that joins the sole to the upper fails and the sole separates from the remainder of the boot.
2. These boots were introduced into service in late 1999.
3. (a) Due to changes in the relevant electronic record keeping systems, Defence does not have readily available access to the required records to determine the number of boots issued prior to September 2004. From September 2004 until December 2007 approximately 27,000 pairs of boots were delivered by the contractor. Of the 27,000 boots delivered by the contractor, approximately 14,000 pairs were issued to Service personnel.
   It is not possible to state the exact quantity of boots that were defective. Many boots did not suffer from de-lamination, but all boots delivered in this period were treated as suspect.
   (b) Since May 2009 3,417 pairs of boots issued to soldiers have been returned and replaced.
4. There have been 182 RODUMs regarding sole de-lamination since these boots entered service in 1999.
5. The first RODUM for sole de-lamination was received in March 2000 and the faulty boots were replaced by the contractor. Defence continued to receive a small number of RODUMs per year and faulty boots continued to be replaced by the contractor on a 'one for one' basis until mid 2008. In mid 2008 the clothing systems program office identified a systemic problem with sole de-lamination.
A detailed technical investigation was conducted in 2008 and early 2009. In March 2009 it was decided that all boots should be stitched to further reduce any risk of failure. Army Headquarters released a Directive outlining the replacement process on 3 April 2009.

In addition to the Army Headquarters Directive, the clothing systems program Office and Army Headquarters also placed articles outlining the replacement process in the Army News in March 2009, April 2009, September 2009, October 2009, April 2010, May 2010, October 2010 and June 2011. Army Headquarters also released follow up Directives in October 2009 and December 2010.

The total period from mid 2008 until April 2009 was approximately ten months.

(6) In February 2009 any boots manufactured prior to January 2008 were removed from clothing stores. These older boots were then quarantined and returned to the manufacturer for stitching. As stitched boots became available the remaining stock of the unstitched boots that was delivered in 2008 and 2009 was also returned and stitched.

Soldiers were advised of the replacement process through the Directives and news articles outlined in the response to Question 5 above.

(7) The total cost of this replacement has been approximately $265,000. In addition, Defence spent approximately $10,000 testing boots as part of the investigation into the de-lamination.

(8) The cost to re-stitch boots returned to the contractor by Defence was met by the contractor.

(9) The contractor has completed the delivery of parade boots. The contractor is delivering other footwear through until July 2012.

**Defence: Helicopters**

(Question No. 1685)

**Senator Johnston** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

With reference to Landing Helicopter Dock (LHD) ships and personnel development:

(1) What is the proposed posted strength of the LHD.

(2) What is the breakdown of personnel posted to the LHD in each of the service areas (ie. army, navy and airforce).

(3) What will the ORBAT be, including the: (a) size; (b) nature; (c) Corps, Category or Mustering; and (d) ranks.

(4) Can details be provided of how the members will be stationed aboard, including: (a) if it will be a posting or short-term secondment; and (b) the length of time.

(5) Which service area will have command over personnel.

(6) What allowances will be paid to members on board.

(7) Does the department currently have technically proficient personnel for each component of the LHD, in particular, for high voltage ancillaries.

(8) What tri-service training has been conducted to prepare members for employment aboard the LHD.

(9) Where will members be sourced from, for example, from a single brigade, ship or group.

(10) Has a tri-service training continuum been developed.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) The proposed posted strength for each of the permanent LHD crews is 351 Australian Defence Force personnel.
(2) The breakdown of the personnel is as follows:
   Navy: 292
   Army: 57
   Air Force: 2

(3) The embarked landing force will be drawn from a Battle Group based upon the 2nd Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment and a cross section of combat and enabling capabilities. This Battle Group will form the core of the amphibious ready element and the amphibious ready group. The ready element will be based upon a combat team and the ready group will be based upon the Battle Group. The ready element and ready group will be task organised and tailored for specific missions. As such it is not possible to provide specific details regarding the size, corps, trade and ranks that will form the embarked landing force as they will change dependant on the task.

(4) (a) and (b) Permanent crew will be posted to the ship on an 18 month to 2 year posting cycle. Embarked force and other attached support will be allocated for shorter periods to be determined by the requirement of the force generation cycle and operational imperative.

(5) The Ship's commanding officer will exercise command over the LHD's crew in all matters and over all other embarked forces, mainly Army personnel, for some administrative and safety issues. Responsibility for the conduct of actual amphibious operations will rest between the Commander Amphibious Task Force (CATF - a Naval officer) and the Commander Landing Forces (CLF - an Army officer). The CATF is normally separate to the Ship's commanding officer. The CATF and CLF are considered co-equal commanders and close cooperation between the two is critical to success.

(6) Permanent members of the ship's crew including Army and Royal Australian Air Force personnel, as detailed in the scheme of complement, will be eligible for seagoing allowance. Members of the embarked force will generally be eligible for an equivalent hard lying allowance payable once the ship has sailed.

(7) The prime contractor for the LHD capability has the responsibility for development of introduction into service individual training. This training will provide specific proficiencies for operation and maintenance of equipment fitted to the LHDs that is not currently in service in the ADF and builds upon the competencies of the personnel designated for the LHD positions. High voltage is a relatively new area of training for the Royal Australian Navy, with specific training to be delivered as part of the LHD introduction into service training. The Navy, however, is already building its expertise in high voltage through the training delivered for the acquisition and operation of HMAS Choules, which is fitted with a high voltage electric podded propulsion system similar to the LHDs.

(8) Significant overseas training has been accessed in the past few years to prepare ADF personnel for the new amphibious capability. Personnel from Army and Navy have been attending United States amphibious courses in increasing numbers. Air Force personnel will conduct training this year with United States Marine Corp and United States Navy air control agencies. Further individual training opportunities with the United Kingdom have been scheduled. Several UK and US collective training activities have been attended by ADF personnel in the past few years, all with a focus on development of amphibious proficiencies. These opportunities are managed through bi-lateral working groups with the UK and US.

(9) The core of the embarked landing force will be drawn from the 2nd Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment from the 3rd Brigade. Combat and other enabling capabilities that may be tasked as part of the amphibious ready element or amphibious ready group could be drawn from the 1st Brigade, 6th Brigade, 16th Aviation Brigade, 17th Combat Service Support Brigade and Special Operations Command.

(10) A tri-service training continuum for the amphibious ready element and amphibious ready group is currently being developed by the deployable Joint Force Headquarters. This involves enabling
exercises for the components of these task groups that are scheduled in the program of major service activities and additional force collective training activities to certify the ready element and ready group models.

**Fair Work Australia**  
(Question No. 1687)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations, upon notice, on 8 March 2012:

(1) How many people were approached by the Minister to apply for the latest round of Fair Work Australia appointments.

(2) How many of the individuals approached by the Minister were subsequently appointed.

(3) What were the names of those individuals:

(a) approached; and

(b) appointed.

Senator Ludwig: The Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

Five people were approached by the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations exploring if they wished to submit an expression of interest in being appointed as a member of Fair Work Australia. Two of those people, Ms Anna Booth and Mr David Gregory, expressed interest, were assessed as suitable for appointment by the selection panel and were subsequently appointed. It would be inappropriate to provide the names of the other persons who chose not to submit an expression of interest.

**Treasury**  
(Question No. 1689)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Assistant Treasurer, upon notice, on 8 March 2012:

With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 1532:

(1) Was the answer provided in the same form as when it was received from the Productivity Commission.

(2) Were changes made by, or as a result of any input from, the Minister's office.

Senator Wong: The Assistant Treasurer has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) Answers to Questions on Notice are given by the relevant Minister and in this case, certain information provided by the Productivity Commission in a suggested answer was removed by the Minister's office as that information was not sought by the Question.

(2) As above.

**Finance and Deregulation**  
(Question No. 1690)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister for Finance and Deregulation, upon notice, on 8 March 2012:

(a) ahead of the Government's decision, were any representations made by the Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills, Jobs and Workplace Relations or the Minister for Small Business; and
(b) if so, can details be provided.

Senator Wong: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

The answer to this question was provided in response to Question on Notice 1305 (Senate Hansard 28 February 2012, proof p.101).

Finance and Deregulation
(Question No. 1692)

Senator Bushby asked the Minister for Finance and Deregulation, upon notice, on 9 March 2012:

(1) What is the current estimated cost of Commonwealth regulation in Australia for:
   (a) agencies which implement regulation; and
   (b) businesses and entities that are subject to regulation.

(2) What is the current estimated impact on productivity resulting from new regulations imposed since 2007.

(3) With reference to the department's annual report for 2010-11, which includes the statement 'Outcome 1 Informed decisions on government finances and continuous improvement in regulation making through: budgetary management and advice; transparent financial reporting; a robust financial framework; and best practice regulatory processes':
   (a) what evidence can be provided indicating that the Government has achieved 'best practice regulatory processes' and that there has been 'continuous improvement in regulation making'; and
   (b) can details be provided as to which regulators have shown improvements in regulatory performance and efficiency, and which regulators have reduced regulatory fees and charges to customers.

Senator Wong: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

(1) (2) and (3) The Government's Deregulation Agenda reflects the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Guiding Principles for Regulatory Quality and Performance (OECD 2005) which require governments (inter alia) to "design economic regulation in all sectors to stimulate competition and efficiency, and eliminate them except where clear evidence demonstrates that they are the best way to serve broad public interests."

The focus of effort of OECD members, including Australia, is on ensuring the regulation is fit for purpose, is developed in consultation with stakeholders and does not impose unnecessary compliance and administrative cost burdens on business and the not-for-profit sector. Measures of costs are not of themselves, therefore, a measure of the efficiency of regulation which necessarily strives to deliver a net community benefit.

All Commonwealth decision-makers are required to adhere to the provisions of the Government's Best Practice Regulation Handbook 2010 which requires that they undertake regulation impact analysis for all regulatory proposals which would have an impact on business or the not-for-profit sector which is anything other than minor or machinery in nature.

The Australian Government's approach to regulatory management features a high degree of transparency, with regular reporting concerning compliance with the requirements for regulation impact assessment, progress against reforms progressed by the Council of Australian Government's Seamless National Economy national partnership agreement and regular reviews of Commonwealth regulatory frameworks by the Productivity Commission as part of its "Regulatory Burdens" series of reviews.

Successive Australian governments have required decision-makers in choosing to regulate, to determine where the balance between costs and benefits of individual regulatory proposals should lie,
consistent with their statutory responsibilities. In its review of regulatory reform in Australia ("Towards a Seamless National Economy: OECD, 2010) the OECD concluded that "Australia is one of the front-running countries in the OECD in terms of its best practice."

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities**

(Question No. 1693)

Senator Waters asked the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, upon notice, on 9 March 2012:

With reference to the Australian Rainforest Foundation (ARF):

1. What funding and support has been provided to ARF by the Commonwealth Government.

2. In relation to all funding provided: (a) what outcomes were expected to be delivered by ARF; and (b) have all of these obligations on ARF been satisfied.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

1. The following funding and support has been provided to the Australian Rainforest Foundation (ARF) since 2008-09:

   a. Under the Grants to Voluntary Environment, Sustainability and Heritage Organisations Program (GVESHO), formerly Grants to Voluntary Environment and Heritage Organisations (GVEHO), the ARF was provided $1,500 in each of 2008-09 and 2009-10.

   b. Under the Community Action Grants program in 2010-11, ARF was awarded $22,000 for project work to be carried out on land at Mission Beach, Queensland. The project involved identifying and spraying noxious weeds and re-vegetating and managing the land through the planting of trees.

2. In relation to all funding provided:

   a. The GVESHO program helps eligible community based organisations to value, conserve and protect Australia's natural environment and historic heritage and to promote sustainability by assisting with their administrative costs. The GVESHO grant amount must be clearly identified as a separate line item in the organisation's financial statement as income from the "Australian Government's GVEHO/GVESHO program".

   b. The ARF has not met its obligation to acquit its 2008-09 and 2009-10 GVESHO grants as per the contractual agreement and therefore the 2010-11 grant of $1,500 has been withheld.

   The Community Action Grant project at Mission Beach is still in progress and is due to be completed by 30 June 2012. The final report is due 30 August 2012.

**Immigration and Citizenship**

(Question No. 1694)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, upon notice, on 13 March 2012:

For the financial years 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11, how many:

1. employer nominations were submitted under regulation 5.19(4) of the Migration Regulations 1994, listed separately by Regional Certifying Body (RCB);

2. employer nominations were approved per each RCB;

3. visas were approved for a Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme visa per each RCB;

4. Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme visa holders were subject to a Notice of Intention to Cancel in line with section 137Q of the Migration Act 1958; and
(e) previous Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme visa holders had a Subclass 857/119 visa cancelled in line with section 137Q of the Migration Act 1958.

**Senator Lundy:** The Minister for Immigration and Citizenship has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

The table at Attachment A lists employer nominations lodged for Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme (RSMS) according to Regional Certifying Body (RCB^).

The table at Attachment B lists employer nominations approved for RSMS according to Regional Certifying Body (RCB^).

The table at Attachment C shows RSMS visas granted according to RCB^.

The table at Attachment D shows the Notice Of Intention to Consider Cancellations (NOICCs) issued under section 137Q of the Migration Act 1958.

The table at Attachment D shows the RSMS visas cancelled under section 137Q of the Migration Act 1958.

^Please note that the name of the RCB is not a mandatory data field when processing nominations and applications in DIAC systems and as such is not always captured. This results in the RCB being listed as ‘Unknown’ in reporting.

**Attachment A**

**Employer Nominations lodged for RSMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Certifying Body</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT Economic Development Directorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albury Wodonga Business Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Central Coast Inc</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns Chamber of Commerce Inc</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns Chamber of Commerce Inc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Development Board</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Western QLD Remote Area Planning &amp; Development Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Western Regional Development Board</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Valley Business Development Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Cairns &amp; Far-North QLD</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Gold Coast &amp; Hinterland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Head Office</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Mackay</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Rockhampton</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Rockhampton &amp; Central QLD</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Sunshine Coast, Wide Bay &amp; Burnett</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Toowoomba &amp; South West QLD</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Townsville &amp; North QLD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Western Regional Development Board</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gascoyne Development Commission</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Area Promotion &amp; Development Limited</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfields Esperance Development Commission</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Southern Development Commission</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Councils Inc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Economic Development Corporation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Regional Development Board</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration SA—Dept of Trade &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Certifying Body</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Development Commission</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid North Coast Regional Development Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid West Development Commission</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Isa Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Isa Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Tasmania—Dept. of Premier &amp; Cabinet</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Regional Development Board</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Inland Regional Development Board</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rivers Regional Development Board</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Dept of State and Regional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT—Dept of Business, Economic &amp; Regional Development</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orana Area Consultative Committee</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel Development Commission</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilbara Development Commission</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Macquarie Chamber of Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD Dept. of State Development, Trade &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Australia Mid North Coast Inc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Ballarat</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Bendigo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Geelong</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Mildura</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Shepparton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Traralgon</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Wangaratta</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Wodonga</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverina Regional Development Board</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma Regional Council</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma Town Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled &amp; Business Migration—ACT Chief Minister's Dept.</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Migration Western Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Centre New England &amp; North-West</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Development Corporation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Development Commission</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS Dept of Economic Development</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville Enterprise Limited</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC Dept of Innovation, Industry &amp; Regional Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City Council</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatbelt Development Commission</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimmera Development Association</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>6,637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B

### Employer Nominations Approved for RSMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Certifying Body</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albury Wodonga Business Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Central Coast Inc</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns Chamber of Commerce Inc</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Development Board</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Western QLD Remote Area Planning &amp; Development Board</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Western Regional Development Board</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Valley Business Development Board</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Cairns &amp; Far-North QLD</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Gold Coast &amp; Hinterland</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Head Office</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Mackay</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Rockhampton</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Rockhampton &amp; Central QLD</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Sunshine Coast, Wide Bay &amp; Burnett</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Toowoomba &amp; South West QLD</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Townsville &amp; North QLD</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Western Regional Development Board</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gascoyne Development Commission</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Area Promotion &amp; Development Limited</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfields Esperance Development Commission</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Southern Development Commission</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Councils Inc</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Economic Development Corporation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Regional Development Board</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration SA—Dept of Trade &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Development Commission</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid North Coast Regional Development Board</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid West Development Commission</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Isa Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Tasmania—Dept. of Premier &amp; Cabinet</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Regional Development Board</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Inland Regional Development Board</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rivers Regional Development Board</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Dept of State and Regional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT—Dept of Business, Economic &amp; Regional Development</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orana Area Consultative Committee</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel Development Commission</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilbara Development Commission</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Macquarie Chamber of Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD Dept. of State Development, Trade &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Australia Mid North Coast Inc</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Ballarat</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Bendigo</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Geelong</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Mildura</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Certifying Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Certifying Body</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Shepparton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Traralgon</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Wangaratta</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Wodonga</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverina Regional Development Board</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma Regional Council</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma Town Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled &amp; Business Migration—ACT Chief Minister's Dept.</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Migration Western Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Centre New England &amp; North-West</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Development Corporation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Development Commission</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS Dept of Economic Development</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville Enterprise Limited</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC Dept of Innovation, Industry &amp; Regional Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City Council</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatbelt Development Commission</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimmera Development Association</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>5,466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attachment C

#### RSMS Visas Granted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomination Regional Certifying Body</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albury Wodonga Business Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Central Coast Inc</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns Chamber of Commerce Inc</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Development Board</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Western QLD Remote Area Planning &amp; Development Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Western Regional Development Board</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Valley Business Development Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Cairns &amp; Far-North QLD</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Gold Coast &amp; Hinterland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Head Office</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Mackay</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Rockhampton</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Rockhampton &amp; Central QLD</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Sunshine Coast, Wide Bay &amp; Burnett</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Toowoomba &amp; South West QLD</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Queensland—Townsville &amp; North QLD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Business, Industry &amp; Resource Development (NT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Premier and Cabinet (SA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of State Development and Innovation (QLD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Western Regional Development Board</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gascoyne Development Commission</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination Regional Certifying Body</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Area Promotion &amp; Development Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfields Esperance Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Southern Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Councils Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Economic Development Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Regional Development Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration SA—Dept of Trade &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>891</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid North Coast Regional Development Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid West Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Isa Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Tasmania—Dept. of Premier &amp; Cabinet</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Regional Development Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Inland Regional Development Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rivers Regional Development Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Dept of State and Regional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT—Dept of Business, Economic &amp; Regional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT- Dept of Business, Economic &amp; Regional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orana Area Consultative Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilbara Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Macquarie Chamber of Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD Dept. of State Development, Trade &amp; Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Australia Mid North Coast Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Ballarat</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Bendigo</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Geelong</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Mildura</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Shepparton</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Traralgon</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Wangaratta</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Victoria—Wodonga</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverina Regional Development Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma Town Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled &amp; Business Migration—ACT Chief Minister's Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Migration Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Centre New England &amp; North-West</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Development Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS Dept of Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville Enterprise Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC Dept of Innovation, Industry &amp; Regional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatbelt Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Year Nomination Regional Certifying Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>3,373</td>
<td>4,043</td>
<td>4,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment D

NOICCs Issued and Cancellations Under Section 137(Q)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12 YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOICCs issued</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prime Minister and Cabinet
(Question No. 1696)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 13 March 2012:

1. What is the annual catering budget for Cabinet?
2. How much of the catering budget for the 2011-12 financial year has been used.
3. What is the cost of catering an average Cabinet meeting.

Senator Chris Evans: The Prime Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

1. There is no annual budget allocation. Consistent with long standing arrangements, each minister makes a personal contribution to the Cabinet Trust Fund to assist in the costs of catering for Cabinet and committee meetings. The Fund is administered by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.
2. From 1 July 2011 to 13 March 2012 $38,970.73 was spent on catering for Cabinet and Cabinet committee meetings.
3. The average catering cost for a Cabinet meeting is $385.84.

School Education, Early Childhood and Youth
(Question No. 1697)

Senator Bob Brown asked the Minister representing the Minister for School Education, Early Childhood and Youth, upon notice, on 14 March 2012:

With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 1096 (Senate Hansard, 7 February 2012, proof p. 176), relating to corporal punishment in non-state schools:

1. Can an explanation be provided regarding the situation of corporal punishment in non-state schools in Queensland?
2. What is the Commonwealth Government's understanding of Section 280 of the Queensland Criminal Code Act 1899, in relation to the use of corporal punishment in non-state schools?

Senator Kim Carr: The Minister for School Education, Early Childhood and Youth has provided the following answers to the honourable senator's question:

1. Response from the Office of Non-State Education, Department of Education and Training, Queensland:
“Although Queensland state schools are prohibited from using corporal punishment, this policy is not enforceable in non-state schools. Behaviour management policies in non-state schools are an internal governance matter for each school. The decision to use corporal punishment is made by each school's governing body, and therefore is a matter for each school to determine. Section 280 of the Criminal Code Act 1899 provides that 'It is lawful for a parent or a person in the place of a parent, or for a schoolteacher or master, to use, by way of correction, discipline, management or control, towards a child or pupil, under the person's care such force as is reasonable under the circumstances.' However, even if a school permits the use of corporal punishment, if the force used is unreasonable in the circumstances the staff member will not be protected by the Criminal Code. Only a very small number of non-state schools in Queensland incorporate corporal punishment into their student behaviour management policies.”

Response from Independent Schools Queensland

“There is no legislation in Queensland which bans corporal punishment in non-state schools. Independent Schools Queensland is the representative body of 183 independent schools in Queensland; however, each independent school governing body is responsible for its policies and operations. Whilst section 280 of the Criminal Code Act 1899 Queensland is relevant, it is not a generally accepted means of behaviour management and has not been for many years. Further, Independent Schools Queensland's advisory behaviour management policies and processes templates do not include corporal punishment as a strategy. Our legislatively mandated Student Protection processes support this approach and require that inappropriate behaviour, suspected harm and harm to students be reported to the school, and in certain cases, the relevant state authority.”

Response from the Queensland Catholic Education Commission

The Queensland Catholic Education Commission on behalf of the 22 Catholic school authorities representing 292 Catholic school communities educating 138 000 students, advises that:

“Corporal punishment in Catholic schools in Queensland, albeit permissible pursuant to s280 Criminal Code Act 1899 Qld, has not been accepted as a means of behaviour management for approximately 15 years. Further, Catholic School Authorities' behaviour management policies and processes do not include corporal punishment as a strategy. Our legislatively mandated Student Protection processes support this approach and require inappropriate behaviour, suspected harm and harm to students to be reported to the school, and in certain cases, the relevant state authority.”

(2) It is inappropriate for the Commonwealth Government to provide interpretation of state legislation.

Section 280 of the Criminal Code Act 1899 (Qld) provides that it is lawful for a schoolteacher or master (or parent or person in the place of a parent) to use by way of correction, discipline, management or control, towards a child or pupil under the person's care “such force as is reasonable in the circumstances.”

The Commonwealth Government does not endorse corporal punishment as an approach to disciplining school students.

Community Services and Status of Women

(Question Nos 1699, 1700 and 1701)

Senator Cash asked the Minister representing the Minister for Community Services and the Minister for the Status of Women, upon notice, on 13 March 2012:

With reference to the Australian Government Office for Women (OfW) website, which states: 'The Office for Women delivers many of the programs and services relevant to women outlined in this website. The programs and services can be found as follows:

Equal Place in Society: Activities and engagement with women's organisations, aimed at improving women's equal place in society'.


Research and Data: Research and data relating to women in Australia.

Economic Security: Aimed at increasing the economic security of Australian women - including pay equity, superannuation, managing money, women in business.

Australian Government Panel of Gender Experts (Gender Panel) User Guide: The Gender Panel supports the development of gender expertise across the Australian government by providing a range of services to promote the integration of gender equality into policy, programs and research.

Social and Community Sector Workers Equal Remuneration Case: The Prime Minister announced on 10 November 2011, that the Australian Government and the Australian Services Union have reached an agreement in the Social and Community Sector Workers Equal Remuneration Case'.

(1) In relation to each of the programs and services outlined above, can details be provided for every program and service delivered by the OfW, including how the program or service is delivered.

(2) Are there Key Performance Indicators for the delivery of each program and/or service; if so, what are they; if not, why not.

(3) Which programs and/or services are not delivered by the OfW, and can an explanation be provided as to why they are not delivered.

(4) For each program and/or service not delivered by the OfW, can details be provided as to:

(a) which office or department is responsible for the delivery;

(b) whether the OfW liaises with the office or department; if so, how; if not, why not; and

(c) how the OfW ensures that the program and/or service is delivered to a satisfactory standard.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Community Services and the Minister for the Status of Women have provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) The Gender Equality for Women program guidelines, publicly available on the Internet, provides details about the program, including the program/service deliverables, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and components of the program. Please refer to:


(2) The Gender Equality for Women program KPIs are available in the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs 2010-2011 Annual Report, for Outcome 6.1. Please refer to:


For more detailed performance measures refer to:


(3) The programs/services not delivered by the Office for Women are those more appropriately delivered by another Commonwealth Department or agency, or by State and Territory Governments.

(4) (a) to (c) Consistent with the Beijing Platform for Action, this Government and the previous Government have supported gender mainstreaming as the best practice approach to ensuring gender is considered in the full range of decisions affecting women.
Departments are accountable through a range of mechanisms and on a range of matters from the Financial Management Accountability Act 1997 to the Parliament Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee Estimates hearings.

**Marriage Celebrants Program**

(Question No. 1702)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 13 March 2012:

1. What feedback has the department received in relation to the proposal to impose a $600 annual fee upon marriage celebrants.
2. Are submissions made in response to the department's discussion paper available on its website.
3. How will the proposed fee benefit marriage celebrants.
4. Given that marriage celebrants already bear substantial costs, such as buying marriage certificates and registers, paying for mandatory ongoing professional development, along with all the other standard and significant costs of being in business, how can the department justify imposing yet another cost without measurable value to the celebrant.
5. Will the imposition of a fee seriously damage the relationship between celebrants and the department.
6. Has the department considered a more scalable solution, such as a per-wedding fee.
7. How does the department intend to reduce the number of celebrants.
8. Is the department hoping that the introduction of a fee will result in attrition of celebrant numbers.
9. How does the department intend to improve its service to celebrants, including frequent communications and the provision of an extended hours (including weekends) help desk for celebrants.
10. Has the department investigated improving the current processes for lodging the Notice of Intended Marriage.
11. Has the department considered a moratorium on new marriage celebrant appointments, especially considering the current high number of celebrants.
12. What disclosure is given to prospective or new celebrants on the state of the market.
13. Why does the Government not provide budget funding for the regulation of the celebrant program, or pass on responsibility to the state registries of births, deaths and marriages.
14. How many civil weddings have been held each year since 2002.
15. How many celebrants have never performed a wedding.
16. What is the average cost of ongoing professional development for celebrants.
17. Who reviews the standard, of ongoing professional development training for celebrants, including the content and the training providers.

Senator Ludwig: The Attorney-General has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question.

1. In the May 2011 Budget, the Government announced a measure to improve the Marriage Celebrants Program, including a move to cost recovery with the introduction of an annual registration fee. This aims to improve the services delivered to Commonwealth-registered marriage celebrants including increased access to the Department, new technology and enhanced information. It will also allow the Commonwealth to effectively regulate Commonwealth-registered marriage celebrants through strengthened application, performance review and complaints handling mechanisms.
Following the Budget announcement, the Department committed to extensive consultation on its details with marriage celebrants and the broader community. The Department hosted 17 face to face consultation meetings across Australia in October and November 2011. Of the approximately 10,300 marriage celebrants invited to attend a meeting, over 1,300 people responded that they intended to attend one of the meetings. Approximately 700 people attended a meeting.

Written submissions were also invited by 9 December 2011, regardless of attendance at a face to face meeting. Over 280 submissions were received from individuals and associations via email, mail or hand delivered during the consultation meetings.

National consultations have now concluded. A paper summarising the feedback provided through the consultations is on the Department's website at www.agd.gov.au/marriage. Further consultations will be held from mid-2012.

(2) No, submissions have not been published on the Attorney-General's Department website. Publishing the written submissions would be a significant resource undertaking for the Department in terms of scanning documents and seeking permission from writers. However, a paper summarising the feedback provided through the consultations is on the Department's website at www.agd.gov.au/marriage.

(3) The precise nature of the broader Program reforms, for example improvements to service delivery by the Attorney-General's Department to support marriage celebrants, are the subject of the consultation process. However, marriage celebrants can expect improved service and accessibility to the Department through an online celebrant portal, a dedicated phone service and enhanced written information, guidance and advice to assist marriage celebrants in performing their role. It will also allow the Commonwealth to effectively regulate Commonwealth-registered marriage celebrants through strengthened application, performance review and complaints handling mechanisms.

(4) The reforms being undertaken to the Marriage Celebrants Program will deliver the benefits outlined in response to question (3). These will lead to less red tape and greater certainty in administration and advice for celebrants.

(5) No. The reforms to the Marriage Celebrants Program will enhance the relationship between marriage celebrants and the Attorney-General's Department by ensuring the financial viability of the Program over the long term. This will enable the Department to provide the benefits to marriage celebrants identified in the response to question (3) above and properly regulate the Program. The Department is committed to extensive and ongoing consultation with marriage celebrants and the broader community to ensure that improvements to the Program are well-directed and constructive.

(6) The Department is considering this issue. The subject of a scalable fee was discussed as part of the consultation process undertaken by the Attorney-General's Department. Some celebrants suggested that the fee be applied on a sliding scale depending on the number of weddings a celebrant performs annually, and that exemptions should also be available for people who are unwell or have compassionate circumstances. However, there was no majority view that a sliding scale was the preferred option.

(7) There is no intention to introduce measures that actively reduce the number of Commonwealth registered marriage celebrants.

(8) No.

(9) The precise nature of the broader Program reforms, for example improvements to service delivery by the Attorney-General's Department to support marriage celebrants, are the subject of the consultation process. However, celebrants can expect improved service and accessibility to the Department through an online celebrant portal, a dedicated phone service and updated written information, guidance and advice to assist marriage celebrants in performing their role. They can also expect improved standards of regulation by the Government through the Department.
(10) Couples give their Notice of Intended Marriage (NOIM) to their marriage celebrant who then lodges it with State and Territory Registries of Births, Deaths and Marriages when registering the marriage. The NOIM form is on the Attorney-General's Department website free of charge to be downloaded by couples or marriage celebrants.

This issue was raised through feedback from the consultations. The reforms to the program are unlikely to consider this issue at this time. However, the Department will consider this issue further should the opportunity to revise the marriage registration process arise.

(11) No. In the consultations undertaken by the Attorney-General's Department, some marriage celebrants suggested that a moratorium on new marriage celebrant appointments be reinstated until the Program reforms have been implemented. However, there was no majority view that this was the preferred option. The Government does not believe a moratorium would achieve the objectives of cost recovery, being to improve services and effectively regulate the Program, thereby improving the compliance and professionalism of marriage celebrants to the benefit of marrying couples and society more generally.

(12) Information for prospective marriage celebrants about the reality of the market and challenges of working as a celebrant is set out on the 'Becoming a celebrant' page of the Attorney General's Department website (Attachment A) and is also included in the application packages provided to prospective celebrants.

(13) The Commonwealth has Constitutional responsibility for marriage. This is why the Government funds the Marriage Celebrants Program. It is also why the Program, and regulation of Commonwealth registered marriage celebrants, is not the responsibility of State and Territory Registries of Births, Deaths and Marriages.

The Attorney-General's Regulation Impact Statement released soon after the announcement of the reforms considered the option of passing responsibility for regulation of marriage celebrants registered under the Program to State and Territory Registries of Births, Deaths and Marriages. This option was identified as not addressing the key objective as it would simply shift the problem of effective regulation of non compliant celebrants to the State and Territory authorities.

(14) The Australian Bureau of Statistics compiles data on religious and civil wedding ceremonies.

The term 'civil celebrants' groups both Commonwealth-registered civil celebrants and officers in State and Territory Registries of Births, Deaths and Marriages (the latter are not regulated by the Department). 'Religious celebrants' groups Ministers from Recognised Denominations and Commonwealth-registered ministers from non-aligned religious organisations (the former are not regulated by the Department). Therefore, the information on the number of civil marriages registered in Australia each year since 2002 is not entirely accurate for the purposes of administering the Marriage Celebrants Program. Based on these definitions, the number of 'civil weddings' registered each year since 2002 are in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of weddings by civil celebrants</th>
<th>Percentage of overall marriages in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>58,035</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>60,207</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>65,100</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>65,105</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>70,105</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>73,187</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>77,142</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>80,390</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>83,121</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(15) Information on how many celebrants have never performed a wedding is not held by this Department. While information could be sought from State and Territory Registries of Births, Deaths
and Marriages about how many celebrants have performed a wedding, it is not readily available and would be time and resource intensive.

(16) Commonwealth-registered marriage celebrants must do five hours of ongoing professional development (OPD) each registration year (1 January to 31 December). OPD consists of one compulsory activity of one hour's duration, and elective activities.

OPD can only be completed through one of three registered training organisations on the Attorney General's Department's panel of OPD providers.

OPD is delivered using face-to-face, online or distance delivery methods. The average annual cost of OPD for marriage celebrants is $180 for face-to-face delivery, $140 for distance delivery and $160 for online delivery.

(17) The Registrar of Marriage Celebrants, in the Attorney-General's Department, reviews and approves the elective activities developed by the OPD panel before they are registered for delivery. The Department writes the content for the compulsory activity each year, and the panel develops it into a deliverable form.

The panel of OPD providers (see response to question (16) above), is responsible for reviewing the standard of OPD training for Commonwealth-registered marriage celebrants and developing elective activities suitable for delivery of OPD using face-to-face, online or distance delivery methods.

An OPD Monitoring Group has been established to monitor OPD delivery and considers feedback from marriage celebrants about activities and suggestions for future topics. The Monitoring Group comprises representatives of the panel of OPD providers, the Coalition of Celebrant Associations (CoCA) (the peak representative body for Commonwealth-registered marriage celebrants), and the Attorney-General's Department. CoCA represents the views of celebrants in this forum.

Finally, each of the OPD Panel members is a Registered Training Organisation which are monitored nationally by the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA). ASQA regulates courses and training providers to ensure nationally approved quality standards are met.

**Defence Honours and Awards Tribunal**

*(Question No. 1715)*

**Senator Ian Macdonald** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

(1) When will a response be provided to the recommendations of the Defence Honours and Awards Appeals Tribunal relating to the recognition of Royal Australian Air Force personnel who served at Ubon air base in Thailand between 1965 and 1968 with the award of the Vietnam Logistic and Support Medal.

(2) Given that the Parliamentary Secretary for Defence, Senator Feeney, was provided the relevant inquiry report on 24 February 2011, can an explanation be provided for the 12 month delay in the provision of a response.

(3) Will the recommendations of the tribunal be accepted; if so, will Letters Patent be drafted in order to give effect to the recommendation.

(4) If the recommendations of the tribunal will not be accepted, with which of the tribunal's conclusions does the Government disagree and why.

**Senator Chris Evans:** The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) The response is presently with the Parliamentary Secretary for Defence for consideration.

(2) The recommendations of the report posed a number of issues that require further investigation within Defence before a response is provided for government consideration.
(3) and (4) It is not possible to provide a response to these questions until government consideration of the report is finalised.

Solar Energy
(Question No. 1718)

Senator Milne  asked the Minister representing the Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, upon notice, on 16 March 2012:

(1) Can a list be provided detailing those pensions and allowances for which payments from feed-in tariffs for household solar energy systems are considered income.

(2) For each of the payments identified in (1), can a detailed breakdown be provided of how each is deemed, including:

(a) how income from feed-in tariffs is identified;

(b) the dollar threshold per allowance or pension at which monies from feed-in tariffs is considered income; and

(c) at what ratio pensions or allowances are then deemed (for example, a \{Question Text\}.50 reduction in pension/allowance per $1 of feed-in tariff income).

(3) Is the Minister aware of the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) private ruling number 88668; if so, how does this ATO ruling inform the deeming of pensions and allowances administered by the department.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs and Minister for Disability Reform has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) Feed-in tariffs from household solar energy systems, paid as cash, are assessed as income for all social security income support payments. These cash payments are assessed as income over a 12 month period. For example, if a pensioner received a cheque from their electricity company for $260, it would be counted as $10 income per fortnight for 26 fortnights.

Feed-in tariffs paid as a credit on an electricity bill, are not assessed as income for social security income support payments.

(2) (a) Feed-in tariffs paid as cash are assessed in the same way as other ordinary income. Social security income support payment recipients are required to report feed-in tariffs from household solar energy systems to the Department of Human Services under the usual notification provisions.

(b) The full amount of a cash feed-in tariff is included in a person's income. However, this may not affect the person's entitlement to a payment as all payments have income free areas. The following income free areas apply.

The income free area for single pensioners is $150 a fortnight. It is $264 a fortnight for partnered pensioners, combined. These limits apply to the Age Pension, Disability Support Pension and Carer Payment.

The income free area for Newstart Allowance, Parenting Payment Partnered, Partner Allowance, Widow Allowance, Youth Allowance (other) and Sickness Allowance payments is $62 a fortnight.

The income free area for Youth Allowance (student), ABSTUDY and Austudy is $236 a fortnight.

The income free area for Parenting Payment Single with one child is $174.60 a fortnight (plus $24.60 a fortnight for each additional child).

This information is set out in a publication distributed by the Department of Human Services, "A Guide to Australian Government Payments" and is available at the Department of Human Services website: www.centrelink.gov.au.
(c) Income over the income test free areas reduces pension by 50 cents in the dollar for single pensioners and by 25 cents in the dollar for partnered pensioners. This applies to the Age Pension, Disability Support Pension and Carer Payment.

For allowances, personal income in excess of the applicable income free area reduces entitlement as follows.

For Newstart Allowance, Parenting Payment Partnered, Partner Allowance, Widow Allowance, Youth Allowance (other), and Sickness Allowance, for income between $62 and $250 a fortnight, the withdrawal rate is 50 cents in the dollar, and for income over $250 a fortnight the withdrawal rate is 60 cents in the dollar.

For Youth Allowance (student), ABSTUDY and Austudy, for income between $236 and $316 a fortnight the withdrawal rate is 50 cents in the dollar, and for income over $316 a fortnight the withdrawal rate is 60 cents in the dollar.

For Parenting Payment Single, for income over $174.60 a fortnight (plus $24.60 a fortnight per additional child) the withdrawal rate is 40 cents in the dollar.

Partner Income does not reduce a person’s entitlement until it exceeds the relevant partner income free area. Generally, for an adult recipient, the partner income free area is $830 a fortnight. Partner income in excess of this amount reduces the person’s entitlement by 60 cents in the dollar. In the special case where one member of a couple is getting a pension, the combined income of both persons is halved, and then the usual income test of the payment that each person is receiving is applied.

This information is set out in a publication distributed by the Department of Human Services, "A Guide to Australian Government Payments" and is available at the Department of Human Services website: www.centrelink.gov.au.

(3) The Minister is aware of the Australian Taxation Office private ruling number 88668. This ruling does not affect the social security income test treatment of feed-in tariffs from solar energy systems.

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities**

*(Question No. 1720)*

**Senator Waters** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, upon notice, on 13 March 2012:

With reference to the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) notice to extend the EPBC assessment time of the Abbot Point Multi Cargo Facility (EPBC ref. 2009/4837):

(1) What further information has been requested of the proponents relating to the direct, consequential and cumulative impacts of the proposal.

(2) What is involved in the ‘cumulative coordinated impact assessment studies’ currently being undertaken by the proponent.

**Senator Conroy:** The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(1) The outcomes of the cumulative impact assessment work being jointly undertaken by a set of proponents at Abbot Point has been requested.

(2) The industry proponents at Abbot Point and the North Queensland Bulk Ports Corporation Limited are working together on a coordinated, cumulative impact assessment, focussed on the combined impacts of proposals at Abbot Point, and within the context of other developments adjoining the Great Barrier Reef. A number of studies are being undertaken as part of this process, including coordinated studies on the potential impacts of habitat loss, lighting, visual amenity, and shipping arising from the Abbot Point proposals.
Native Forests: Timber Exports
(Question No. 1721)

Senator Ludlam asked the Minister representing the Assistant Treasurer, upon notice, on 15 March 2012:

With reference to question on notice no. 1322 (Senate Hansard, 27 February 2012, proof p. 120), and given that the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences provides statistics about Australian forest and wood products in cubic metres, not tonnes, in relation to the export of sawn native forest timbers from Western Australia, for each of the following financial years: 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11:

(a) how many cubic metres of sawn jarrah and karri were exported from Western Australia on a per species basis;
(b) what was the total volume exported; and
(c) which ports received the timber (for each port, provide details of the quantity of each species received and the total volume exported).

Senator Wong: The Assistant Treasurer has provided the following answer to the honourable senator’s question:

(a) Data is not captured in cubic metres.
(b) N/A
(c) This question was answered in SEN 1322, also asked by Senator Ludlam, including the details of the ports in receipt of timber, measured in tonnes. The data is not available for cubic metres.

Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, and Disability Reform: Program Funding
(Question No. 1725)

Senator Siewert asked the Minister representing the Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs and Minister for Disability Reform, upon notice, on 16 March 2012:

(1) Has the department or Minister’s office been approached by, or provided funding and other support to, any of the following organisations since March 2011:
- Azure Funds Management Pty Ltd;
- Azure Capital Pty Ltd;
- Point Torment Supply Base Pty Ltd;
- Indigenous Investment Management Pty Ltd;
- KRED Enterprises Pty Ltd (ACN 147677156);
- Kimberley Regional Economic Development Corporation Pty Ltd (ACN 147677147); and
- the Western Australian Government;

if so, for each organisation:
(a) can details be provided of the nature of the contact or funding and support; and
(b) did the contact or funding and support relate to proposals to develop a port at Point Torment, Western Australia.

(2) Has the department been approached by any organisation (other than those listed above) in regard to a proposal to develop a port at Point Torment since March 2011.
Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs and Minister for Disability Reform have provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question

(1) The Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA) has not been approached, or provided funding or other support to the following organisations since March 2011:

- Azure Funds Management Pty Ltd;
- Azure Capital Pty Ltd;
- Point Torment Supply Base Pty Ltd;
- Indigenous Investment Management Pty Ltd;
- KRED Enterprises Pty Ltd; and
- The Kimberley Regional Economic Development Corporation.

(a) FaHCSIA has provided funding to the Western Australian Government for a number of programs.

(b) None of the contracts or funding provided to the Western Australian Government relate to proposals to develop a port at Point Torment.

(2) FaHCSIA has not been approached by any other organisation in regard to a proposal to develop a port at Point Torment since March 2011.

Infrastructure and Transport
(Question No. 1727)

Senator Johnston asked the Minister representing the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, upon notice, on 20 March 2012:

With reference to the report that the Adagold Aviation Pty Ltd contracted Middle East Area of Operation (MEAO) aircraft, operated by the Portuguese carrier Hi Fly, was involved in an incident at Darwin airport after departing Sydney on Tuesday, 28 February 2012:

(1) When did the incident occur.

(2) What were the weather conditions when the Hi Fly aircraft experienced a heavy landing at the Darwin airport.

(3) What damage was sustained by the Hi Fly aircraft during the landing.

(4) What is the nationality of the pilot/s who landed the aircraft.

(5) What certification and qualifications are held by the pilot/s who landed the aircraft.

Was the aircraft inspected by Australian authorities to determine its air-worthiness; if so:

(a) when; and

(b) can a copy of the inspection report be provided.

Given that the aircraft involved in the incident was held in Darwin subject to a technical assessment by the aircraft operator and an investigation by the Australian Transport Safety Bureau (ATSB), can:

(a) details of the investigation into the technical status of the aircraft; and

(b) a copy of the ATSB report, be provided.

(6) When was the aircraft cleared by ATSB as ready to fly and operate on the MEAO Air Sustainment Charter.

(7) What was the age, model and condition of the aircraft.
(8) In regard to the replacement aircraft used to fly to Dubai:
(a) who provided the necessary certification enabling a replacement aircraft to be flown to Dubai without undergoing inspection in Australia;
(b) can a copy of this certification be provided;
(c) from whom was the aircraft chartered; and
(d) how did it meet the very strict operating conditions of the MEAO Air Sustainment Charter in such a short period of time.

Senator Kim Carr: The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) Tuesday, 28 February 2012 at 23:27 CST.
(2) The ATSB investigation is ongoing and this information will be discussed and published in the final report (expected by June 2012).
(3) The ATSB investigation is ongoing and this information will be discussed and published in the final report (expected by June 2012).
(4) The ATSB investigation is ongoing and this information will be discussed and published in the final report (expected by June 2012).
(5) The ATSB investigation is ongoing and this information will be discussed and published in the final report (expected by June 2012).
(6) The aircraft was not inspected by CASA. The responsibility for airworthiness oversight of this aircraft lies with their National Airworthiness Authority.
(7) The ATSB investigation is ongoing and this information will be discussed and published in the final report (expected by June 2012).
(8) ATSB didn't clear the aircraft as ready to fly as it is not a role or function of the ATSB.
(9) The ATSB investigation is ongoing and this information will be discussed and published in the final report (expected by June 2012).
(10) HiFly's management advised CASA that the replacement aircraft registration CS-TQL operated the flight. This aircraft is listed on HiFly's Air Operators Certificate Operations Specifications and no action in relation to this substitution was required from CASA.

Christmas Island
(Question No. 1730)

Senator Siewert asked the Minister representing the Minister for Regional Australia, Regional Development and Local Government, upon notice, on 20 March 2012:

(1) Is the Minister aware of the ongoing dust problems associated with phosphate loading at Christmas Island.
(2) Are the impacts of the dust associated with phosphate loading being monitored on an ongoing basis.
(3) Are the impacts of spilled phosphate on the surrounding marine environment monitored.

Senator Conroy: The Minister for Regional Australia, Regional Development and Local Government has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The export of phosphate is important to the economy of Christmas Island.

Measures are in place to manage phosphate dust during the loading of ships in the working port of Christmas Island.
The Western Australian Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) licenses Phosphate Resources Limited (PRL) trading as Christmas Island Phosphates under the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (WA)(CI) to conduct bulk material loading and unloading of phosphate. The licence contains a number of conditions relating to dust monitoring and management including a requirement to update and submit a Dust Management Plan by 30 November 2012. During ship loading, the licensee is required to take specified measures which vary according to the wind direction and monitor the dust levels using a mobile dust monitor. Results of dust monitoring are provided to DEC in accordance with licence conditions.

Monitoring of phosphate levels in the marine environment is not considered necessary. Given the high energy of the marine environment, phosphate is rapidly dispersed and this significantly reduces the likelihood of any detrimental environmental impact. Phosphate is a naturally occurring substance on Christmas Island and after heavy rains can leach into the marine environment.

**Australian Federal Police**

(Question No. 1731)

Senator Back asked the Minister representing the Minister for Home Affairs, upon notice, on 21 March 2012:

Given that members of the Australian Federal Police (AFP) serving in the Solomon Islands and Sudan on capacity building missions receive the Police Overseas Service Medal, can the Minister provide an explanation as to why AFP members deployed on similar, often hazardous, missions in locations such as Afghanistan, Timor-Leste and Papua New Guinea are denied appropriate recognition by the awarding of the medal.

Senator Ludwig: The Minister for Home Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The current Police Overseas Service Medal (POSM) Regulations recognise the service given by members of an Australian police force who perform a 'peacekeeping' service either as part of an international operation or following a request for assistance by a foreign government.

As the United Nations is a peacekeeping organisation, AFP members deployed as part of the UN missions to Sudan and Timor-Leste are eligible for the POSM.

The Regional Assistance Mission in the Solomon Islands (RAMSI) has been declared a peacekeeping mission and members deployed to RAMSI are eligible for the POSM. The RAMSI mission is transitioning to capacity building and the AFP are monitoring this situation and will advise the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet when RAMSI is no longer considered peacekeeping and is therefore not eligible for the POSM.

Service in Papua New Guinea and Afghanistan have been determined as capacity building and training respectively. As this is not peacekeeping service, it does not fall under the current requirement for the POSM and members who deploy to these missions are not entitled to the award.

There are currently no awards within the Australian Honours system for police officers who perform overseas capacity building or training service. AFP members may be nominated and receive awards under the AFP's Internal Awards Framework specifically for such service/operations. These include awards such as the Commissioner's Medal for Excellence, Commendations and Group Citations for Bravery, Conspicuous Conduct, Excellent and Hazardous Overseas Service and the AFP Operations Medal.
Cyber White Paper
(Question No. 1732)

Senator Ludlam asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

With reference to the development of the Cyber White Paper:
(a) which agencies are involved in the paper;
(b) will a draft be released for community consultation;
(c) what is the expected release date;
(d) does the Cyber White Paper Committee plan to take evidence through public hearings; and
(e) what budget and staffing resources have been allocated.

Corrigendum: On 11 April 2012, Senator Ludlam's office advised that the reference to 'the Cyber White Paper Committee' in part (d) of QON 1732 should read 'the Cyber Policy Coordinator and the Cyber Security Policy and Coordination Committee'.

Senator Chris Evans: The Prime Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(a) The following agencies have been members of the governance committees associated with developing the Cyber White Paper:
   Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
   Attorney-General's Department
   AusAID
   Australian Communications and Media Authority
   Australian Competition and Consumer Commission
   Australian Crime Commission
   Australian Customs and Border Protection Service
   Australian Federal Police
   Australian Government Information Management Office
   Australian Postal Corporation
   Australian Taxation Office
   Department of Broadband, Communications, and the Digital Economy
   Department of Defence
   Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
   Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs
   Department of Finance and Deregulation
   Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
   Department of Human Services
   Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education
   Department of Infrastructure and Transport
   Department of Regional Australia, Local Government, Arts & Sport
   Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism
   Office of the Australian Information Commissioner
Office of Best Practice Regulation
Office of National Assessments
Treasury.

(b) No, however there was an extensive public consultation process undertaken as part of the development of the Cyber White Paper.

(c) Mid 2012.

(d) No, however there was an extensive public consultation process undertaken as part of the development of the Cyber White Paper.

(e) Costs for the Cyber White Paper are being met from the current departmental allocation. Approximately $250,000 has been allocated to the Cyber White Paper. At its peak, 11 officials from across Government were working on the Cyber White Paper.

Defence

(Question No. 1734)

Senator Ryan asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

(1) Has permission been sought for a domestic pet to travel on a Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) VIP flight by any minister or the Prime Minister; if so, can details of each such flight be provided, including the:
   (a) date; and
   (b) departure and arrival points.

(2) Has a domestic pet been listed on a flight manifest for a RAAF VIP flight by any minister or the Prime Minister; if so, can details of each such flight be provided, including the:
   (a) date; and
   (b) departure and arrival points.

(3) For each flight where permission was sought for a domestic pet to travel on a RAAF VIP flight with a minister or the Prime Minister; or, where a domestic pet was at any time listed on a flight manifest for a flight involving a minister or the Prime Minister, can details be provided for each flight where the domestic pet did not subsequently travel, including the:
   (a) date; and
   (b) departure and arrival points.

Senator Chris Evans: The Prime Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) Permission has not been sought by the Prime Minister, or on her behalf, for a domestic pet to travel on Special Purpose Aircraft.

(2) N/A.

(3) N/A.

Defence: Air Travel

(Question No. 1735)

Senator Ryan asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:
(1) Has permission been sought for a domestic pet to travel on a Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) VIP flight by the Prime Minister or any minister; if so, can details of each such flight be provided, including:
   (a) date; and
   (b) departure and arrival points.

(2) Has a domestic pet been listed on a flight manifest for a RAAF VIP flight by the Prime Minister or any minister; if so, can details of each such flight be provided, including:
   (a) date; and
   (b) departure and arrival points.

(3) For each flight where permission was sought for a domestic pet to travel on a RAAF VIP flight with the Prime Minister or a minister; or, where a domestic pet was at any time listed on a flight manifest for a flight involving a minister or the Prime Minister, can details be provided for each flight where the domestic pet did not subsequently travel, including:
   (a) date; and
   (b) departure and arrival points.

Senator Chris Evans: The Minister for Defence has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

Since 2007, Air Force is not aware of any domestic pet being carried on a RAAF VIP flight. Since 2007, no Prime Minister or Minister has sought permission for a domestic pet to be transported on Special Purpose Aircraft flights. Should such a request be received and approved, however, no flight manifest details are kept as pets would be treated and carried as cargo.